

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

Pre-Raphaelitism and the professional ideal : art, criticism, and sexuality

Thesis

How to cite:

Priest, Robert Charles (1995). Pre-Raphaelitism and the professional ideal : art, criticism, and sexuality. PhD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 1995 The Author

Version: Version of Record

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Robert Charles Priest

BA(hons) 2(i) The Open University, 1986

MA in Cultural Studies, The University of Leeds, 1990.

**Pre-Raphaelitism and the Professional
Ideal: Art, Criticism, and Sexuality**

Thesis offered for examination for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Art History

9 December 1995

Abstract

This dissertation examines the professional ideal in relation to the development and transformation of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood between the late 1840s and the 1880s.

The first chapter examines how one might relate the recent theoretical work on nineteenth-century professionalism by Harold Perkin to the distinctive art practice of the Pre-Raphaelites.

In chapter two, the discussion focuses on how the professional ideal was shaped by the development of a frequently hostile periodical press that insisted on seeing the Pre-Raphaelites as a distinctive group.

The third chapter considers how the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood developed professional identities that diverged from the careers of those artists sponsored by the Royal Academy. The chapter looks in particular at the innovative exhibiting strategies that the Pre-Raphaelites undertook to market their work.

Chapter Four compares how differently John Everett Millais and Dante Gabriel Rossetti responded to attacks on Pre-Raphaelitism, and how they were ultimately drawn to contrasting aspects of professionalism. Their divergent careers reveal a major tension between entrepreneurial and professional ideals in the art market.

The final chapter examines the 'fleshly school' controversy that surrounded Rossetti and the early Aesthetes of the 1870s. This concluding study reveals how Rossetti's contentious representation of sexual subject-matter played a crucial role in the consolidation of the professional ideal.

| | |
|---|------|
| Table of Contents | Page |
| List of Plates | iv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| 1. Art, Work and the Professional Ideal | 15 |
| 2. Periodicals, Professionalism and the PRB | 67 |
| 3. Exhibiting Professionalism | 125 |
| 4. Professionals, Consumers and Cliques | 188 |
| 5. Professionalism and the Flesh | 240 |
| Conclusion | 313 |
| Appendix A | 316 |
| Appendix B | 317 |
| Bibliography | 318 |
| Plates | |

List of Plates

Plate 1 Ford Madox Brown, Work, 1865. Oil on canvas, arched top, 137 x 197.3 cm. (53 15/16 x 77 11/16 in.) City of Manchester Art Galleries.

Plate 2 Detail of Work, the 'effeminate beggar/flowerseller'.

Plate 3 Detail of Work, the 'Beerseller'.

Plate 4 Detail of Work, 'vote for Bobus'.

Plate 5 Ford Madox Brown, First rough sketch for 'Work', 1856. Pencil on paper, 27.8 x 34.7 cm (10 15/16 x 15 5/8 in.) City of Manchester Art Galleries.

Plate 6 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Girlhood of the Virgin Mary, 1848-49. Oil on canvas, 83.2 x 65.4 cm (32 3/4 x 25 3/4 in.) The Tate Gallery.

Plate 7 John Everett Millais, John Ruskin, 1853-54. Oil on canvas, 78.7 x 67.9 cm. (31 x 26 3/4 in.) Private collection.

Plate 8 John Everett Millais, Autumn Leaves, 1855-56. Oil on canvas, 104.1 x 124.5 (41 x 49 in.) City of Manchester Art Galleries.

Plate 9 John Everett Millais, A Huguenot, on St Bartholomew's Day, Refusing to Shield Himself from Danger by Wearing the Roman Catholic Badge, 1851-52. Oil on canvas, arched top, 93.7 x 61.6 cm. (36 1/2 x 24 1/4 in.) Makins Collection.

Plate 10 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, The First Anniversary of the Death of Beatrice, 1853. Water-colour on paper, 41.9 x 61 cm. (16 1/2 x 24 in.) Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

Plate 11 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Beatrice Meeting Dante at a Wedding Feast, Denies Him Her Salutation, 1852. Water-colour on paper, 34.3 x 41.9 cm. (13 1/2 x 16 1/2 in.) Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

Plate 12 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Found, 1854-81, Oil on canvas, 91.4 x 80 cm. (36 x 31 ½ in.) Delaware Art Museum, Wilmington, USA. Samuel and Mary R. Bancroft Memorial Collection.

Plate 13 Thomas Seddon, The Valley of Jehoshaphat: Painted on the Spot, during the Summer and Autumn Months, 1854-55. Oil on canvas, 67.3 x 83.2 cm. (26 ½ x 32 ¾ in.) The Tate Gallery.

Plate 14 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Lady Lilith (1868) repainted 1872-73, Oil on canvas, 95.3 x 81.3 cm. (37 ½ x 32 in.) Delaware Art Museum, Wilmington, USA. (This version was repainted with the face of Alexa Wilding.)

Plate 15 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Lady Lilith (1867) water-colour on paper, 50.8 x 42.9 cm. (20 x 16 7/8 in.) The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, USA. (This version retains the face of Fanny Cornforth.)

Plate 16 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Astarte Syriaca, 1877, Oil on canvas, 182.9 x 106.7 cm. (72 x 42 in.) Manchester City Art Galleries.

Introduction

There are three strands of nineteenth-century artistic and cultural experience that form the fabric of this dissertation: Pre-Raphaelitism; professionalism; gender and sexuality. My central premise is that Pre-Raphaelitism largely developed as it did in the second half of the nineteenth century because of changing ideas about male middle-class professionalism and what it meant to be a professional artist. The formulation of professional Pre-Raphaelite and artistic practices, however, became part of an important debate that had a bearing not only on what it meant to be a professional artist but also on what it meant to be masculine or feminine. Ultimately, my argument rests on the proposition that the measure of artistic professionalism in an art market dominated by men was dependent on the representation of women. Conflicting depictions of a feminine ideal had become the effective line of demarcation between the middle-class establishment and avant-garde artists. The artists themselves utilised an image of woman who was both body and soul, good and bad, to represent their own activities as cultural producers at once involved in the sale of art and above it.

Before progressing further, it is probably as well to establish the terms in which I will discuss the nature of professionalism.¹ The term 'professional' had already by the 1840s extended beyond describing members of the traditional professions of church, medicine and officers in the army and navy. A professional could be characterised as one who undertook various genteel amateur activities in a paid capacity. One thinks especially of music, and later, sport. But

'professionalism' also came to identify a particularly progressive and competent approach to traditional occupational fields. Examples of this attitude are evident in the growing respect for army engineers, civil engineers, and surgeons. This growing practical and scientific interpretation of professionalism was one that accorded well with the ideology of the emerging commercial and industrial middle class of early Victorian Britain. It is this concept of the professional that was most influential when the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood was formed in 1848. However, during the course of the nineteenth century the concept of the professional undergoes a significant transformation. By the beginning of the twentieth century, the practically competent engineer and manager is replaced by the altruistic and socially concerned civil servant as the ideal of the professional. The commercial concerns of the middle class as represented by the skilled engineer and manager had become secondary to an ideal that was evidenced by concern for the social price that the pursuit of profit exacted from the poor and the weak. This ideological transformation had a significant effect on many professional activities, not the least those which are the concern of this dissertation.

The professional life of a painter, whether Pre-Raphaelite or Post-Impressionist, encompasses many practices which converge on the central practice of producing a work of art. Ideas, research, the employment of models, decisions about size and intended audience and the market for work, are all considerations that have to be addressed by the artist before he or she begins to apply brush to canvas. If the work has been commissioned or if the artist has interested a buyer at an early stage of the production of the painting, then there will be the wishes of the customer to consider. When the painting is finished the

artist has to exhibit it, collect money for it if possible and, if he or she considers it an important painting in relationship to their overall production, the artist must ensure that his or her reputation is enhanced commensurately. I am necessarily drawing attention to the very obvious conditions that affect the production of a work of art for one good reason. Although it has promoted the importance of such conditions, the discipline of art history has had a tendency to ignore the process of professionalization involved in cultural production.

This project arose from my earlier post-graduate work on Pre-Raphaelitism in which I began to perceive the possibility of a relationship between Pre-Raphaelitism, professionalism, and modernism. At that time, the problem that presented itself to me was that although work had been done on the relationship between professionalism and modernism, and on professionalism and the Victorian art market, both areas of research seemed to exclude Pre-Raphaelitism. Critical accounts of the Victorian professional artistic world of salerooms and specialist periodicals, although often illuminating, applied more appositely to the careers of popular Academicians than they did to Pre-Raphaelites. In this respect the work of Julie F. Codell on Marion Harry Spielmann, the influential art critic and editor of the Magazine of Art from 1887 until 1904, and on the debates about professional artists and critics in the Fine Arts Quarterly Review are excellent examples. Codell's study identifies change 'in status and [the] struggle for professionalization' but it is firmly linked to the boom in reproductions and a 'new upper middle-class consumerism'.² Such an interpretation of professionalism excludes Rossetti while presenting the model of the commercial and popular Millais as the true professional. Elsewhere, Codell states that the 'dilemma of defining professionalism, an issue that became central to the art literature of the

1890s and early 1900s, lay in the very nature of art itself'.³ While Codell addresses the controversy between two opposing schools of criticism—what we might call Pre-Raphaelite and conventional—she does not identify the diverging nature of the middle-class professional ideal. The debates that Codell traces clearly point to changing beliefs about what it means to be a professional artist but while she indicates professionalism as a factor, it is one that has a limited immediate bearing on her particular area of research. Yet the professionalism of which Codell writes is one that had been influenced by the activities of the Pre-Raphaelites.

The institutions of Pre-Raphaelitism, the Brotherhood, The Germ, group exhibitions, and partisan criticism, seemed to presage the professional institutions of modernism. The Pre-Raphaelite style, however—from the early hard-edged historicism of Hunt and Millais, to the later other-worldly heroines of Rossetti and Burne-Jones—is deemed to belie the apparent progressive quality inherent in those institutions. Ian Fletcher writes that although 'The Germ was to play such a considerable rôle in inspiring other minority periodicals in the 1890s in general literary and artistic value it compares unfavourably with its successors'.⁴ While Fletcher's criticism has its merits, it fails to appreciate the full significance of The Germ's appearance and the professional implications of its influence on later schools. There is an essential difficulty in regarding early Pre-Raphaelite production as part of the debate about professionalism carried out at the end of the century since the professional ideal had changed enormously over the course of the preceding fifty years. Early Victorian models of professionalism were, in the words of Frank Mort, 'hard edged and scientific'.⁵ This was a professionalism based on statistics, empirical knowledge, accuracy and profit. While this

commercial professionalism influenced the production of The Germ, that model of professionalism should not be seen as the one that accounts for The Germ's later influence. Although an earlier professionalism offered insights into the initial production of the Pre-Raphaelites, to hold to that model throughout the course of Pre-Raphaelite production seemed to lead only to the esoteric production of Holman Hunt and the commercialism of Millais. The far more influential, evocative and nuanced work of Rossetti appears to deny and contradict the commercial professional model.

Similar methodological difficulties have beset other researchers in this field. In his recent book Victorian Masculinities, (1995) Herbert Sussman provides an interesting insight into the link between monastic and professional ideas and Victorian artistic and literary production. While Sussman's conjunction of a medieval monastic brotherhood and a determined professionalism is productive until the 1850s, his model fails satisfactorily to accommodate or explain later developments. It was the work of Harold Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society (1969) and The Rise of Professional Society (1989), that provided a theoretical model of professionalism that I felt might offer a way forward. On reading Perkin's work, it became clear that he was proposing a paradigm of middle-class ideology that offered some insight into both early and late Pre-Raphaelite production. The professionalism that informed the practice of the young Pre-Raphaelite brothers was one that emerged with the rise of the middle class. That middle class, however, was far from monolithic or homogeneous. While the realisation of such diversity complicates any analysis of professionalism, it also promises a structure on which to base a systematic analysis. The several class fractions of the middle class had differing requirements

of professionalism, although initially all seemed to serve the ideological demands of the commercial and industrial fraction. In fact, the problem with identifying the character of professionalism in the mid-Victorian period is that it is difficult to separate it from its symbiotic relationship with the dominant middle-class ideal, what Perkin calls the 'entrepreneurial ideal'. Let me explain why.

The intellectual fraction of the middle class began by supporting their mercantile and industrialist brothers in pursuit of competition, a free market and social improvement through an honest profit. Intellectuals like James Mill and Edwin Chadwick provided an ideology for the middle class that was based on science, empiricism and moral certainty – and a belief that less government was good government. As Perkin says:

The cheap and efficient government demanded by the entrepreneurial ideal could only be provided by expert professional administrators selected by merit. As allies they conquered, achieving in the creation of the modern bureaucratic administrative machine and the new civil service qualified and finally selected by examination a clearer-cut victory than in Parliamentary Reform. Yet in the process the professional ideal began to diverge from its ally, and the administrative system which resulted was so different from the minimal, non-interventionist State of the entrepreneurial ideal as almost to be its mirror image.⁶

It was then the same science and empiricism that served commerce which eventually convinced the professionals that positive action was required to cure society's ills, that more government, rather than less, was needed. The problem for the professional class was that, unlike the aristocracy and the entrepreneurial

class, it did not have control of massive economic resources. The response of the professional class to this problem was to establish the person of the professional as capital—by which I mean the owner of special and essential talents and knowledge—and to endow that person with supreme moral integrity. This dissertation shows that Pre-Raphaelitism is implicated in the development of what Perkin calls the 'professional ideal'.

Although Perkin does not deal in any specific way with art—indeed, he finds the case of the gifted artist a difficult one to assimilate into his theory—his analysis of the professional ideal has enabled me to gain insights into the significance of Pre-Raphaelite artistic and professional activity. I have, of course, consulted other social and cultural theorists, most notably Raymond Williams, whose Culture (1981) contains useful ideas on cultural institutions and formations which helped to bridge the gap between social and cultural history.⁷ Williams provides a clear explanation of the importance of 'class fractions'. He explains that 'groups within a class may be rising and falling in importance,' or may have 'alternative (received or developed) cultural, often religious, affiliations which are not characteristic of the class as a whole'.⁸ Similarly, Stefan Collini offers an interesting variation on the theme of the professional ideal in Public Moralists (1991), in his discussion of the 'culture of altruism'.⁹ Finally, T. W. Heyck, in The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England (1982), furnishes a helpful discussion about the importance of specialisation, a 'theme weaving through the forces of change in intellectual life'.¹⁰ The significant test of a developing theoretical base is, I believe, that it supplies a reasonably convincing explanation for both early and late Pre-Raphaelite production, or at least that the theory proves flexible enough to accommodate change.

As my research progressed I identified certain areas of cultural practice and a number of cultural practitioners that offered the necessary scope for analysis. It seemed most constructive to begin with the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood itself and to identify ways in which significant characteristics of their professional practice differed from that of their contemporaries. Pre-Raphaelite artists and critics are at the centre of a transformation that reformulates the relationship of gender and sexuality to the artist and to the work of art. The identification of the characteristics of that transformation provide the possibility to establish a critical insight into an emerging society that was soon to be governed by adherents of the professional ideal and whose artistic production is generally described by art historians as modernist. A major problem for any analyst of the Victorian period, however, is the extent and complexity of the social and cultural change that took place. The 1840s, in which Pre-Raphaelitism's first youthful treble was heard, was a very different age from the 1870s and 1880s, when the dominant voice of Pre-Raphaelitism was the seductive and sensual murmurings of an ageing roué. It is not surprising then, that what seemed necessary reforms to produce a modern professional artist in 1848, when the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood was formed, had undergone a radical change by 1882, when Dante Gabriel Rossetti died.

The threads that link a number of Pre-Raphaelite practices — art production, art criticism, and art exhibiting — at various times between 1850 and 1880 are those of professionalism and sexuality. In the chapters that follow I demonstrate how the vocational activities of Pre-Raphaelite artists point to an ideological — as much as an aesthetic — debate as the site of Pre-Raphaelitism. The first chapter identifies the theoretical nature of the professional ideal and

compares Perkin's analysis of the transformation of the Victorian middle class with that of other social and cultural historians, Williams, Collini and Heyck, to establish a methodology for the ensuing chapters. To test the relevance of Perkin's work to Pre-Raphaelite art practice, I will at this stage undertake a detailed reading of Ford Madox Brown's Work (1852 – 65).

In chapter two, I begin by exploring the reception that greets the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood when they first emerge onto their professional stage. The nature of this reception is a guide to what is conventionally considered professional practice, and to the ways in which the Brotherhood is seen to subvert that practice. The attacks on the Brothers are typical of a partisan form of criticism generated by an incestuous system of reviewing in which practising artists were anonymously noticing paintings that might hang next to their own in the Royal Academy exhibition. Yet the periodical debate around Pre-Raphaelitism, although no doubt intended to provide a convenient label to more easily target the victims, makes artists associated with the movement identifiable in a way that enables them to benefit from a changing market in art. In addition, Victorian periodicals provided a means of establishing professional identity for emerging middle-class men who wished to gain a higher status for their occupational groups. Therefore, I consider what characteristics those professional journals share with the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood's own journal, The Germ.

Chapter Three considers the active nature of Pre-Raphaelites in developing an alternative to the career development envisaged in the eighteenth century with the founding of the Royal Academy. While the exhibiting and marketing strategies that develop during the early years of Pre-Raphaelitism seek to create a free market alternative to the Royal Academy, and so are linked to the

entrepreneurial ideal, other concurrent developments in the area of criticism and dealing point to ideological developments as well as purely commercial ones. Activities such as group and one-man shows confirmed a stylistic unity that proved marketable, but also promoted values that set the artist apart from the market-place. The emerging ideological differences between the commercial and the intellectual middle class can also be identified in the activities of individual artists. Millais and Rossetti approach their market and succeed in their profession in very different ways. The careers of these two artists demonstrate how the critical atmosphere surrounding Pre-Raphaelitism and the pressures of the modern art market, could generate, and accommodate, two very different responses. Chapter Four compares the way both Millais and Rossetti reacted to the antipathy towards Pre-Raphaelitism. The two artists essentially chose divergent paths that take Rossetti towards a rendezvous with the new professional ideal while Millais demonstrates the effect of the successful entrepreneurial ideal on the Victorian artist and art market.

In Chapter Five, I look at the 'fleshly school' controversy that surrounded the work of Rossetti and the early Aesthetes in the 1870s. I examine the idea that professional society seeks to treat 'men as men'—as grown up people who are able to cope with matters that, in the words of Dickens's Mr. Podsnap, might 'bring a flush to the cheek of a young person'. The development of the professional intellectual and artist in Britain during the nineteenth century follows closely on a model established by scientists seeking academic respectability and freedom from direct industrial application. Heyck puts forward a convincing argument for the scientist as a model for the Victorian intellectual. Since Heyck makes a strong case for the importance of specialisation as a

transforming process in the production of professional intellectuals, I utilise this as an indicator of changing attitudes to professionalism. Finally, the discussion examines the sexuality, or rather the representation of the sexuality, of intellectuals, especially artists. The idea that the artist enjoys more sexual freedom, and possibly deviance, appears to develop as a popular idea, seeming to emerge with the growth of a bohemian avant-garde. That artists and intellectuals are largely homosexual seems to be a particularly Anglo-Saxon conception and one that centres closely on the 'fleshly' controversy and the development of the Aesthetic movement. This final chapter, therefore, brings together the threads of professionalism, and practice and the representation of sexuality in image and text that have surfaced throughout the dissertation. In conclusion, I establish the importance of gender and sexuality and the representation of the feminine to the growing professionalism of the artist. Paradoxically, by this point the professionalism of the artist requires him or her to be seen not as supremely competent but as essentially unworldly.

This concluding discussion reveals that the disinterested judgement of the professional class – that is a judgement made from within their specialism without thought of material gain – was established, in part, by the idea of the artist. Art (along with the ivory tower of the academic) came to be represented as an unworldly vocation. The artist – seen as separate and other from the middle class from which he sprang – was perceived by that class as the moral underwriter – a secular cleric – of the professional middle class. The idea of the total separation of the artist from the market, from profit and, ultimately, from society, as proposed by such cultural critics as Matthew Arnold and Walter Pater, was what made the altruism of the professional class seem reasonable and

possible. The colonisation of the feminine is a central factor in the achievement of this project. In specialising in the representation of women the artist is seen to subsume the feminine point of view and the virtues of an intense spirituality. Yet Pre-Raphaelitism, the artists identified with that movement, and those linked to the later Aesthetic movement of the 1880s were attacked for their art practice and their supposed attitude to sexuality by critics and fellow artists for most of the century. Those attacks were based on various grounds, from technical incompetence to alleged immorality, but finally must be seen as evidence of the changing nature of the profession of artist.

Ultimately, I show that the formulation of professional Pre-Raphaelite and artistic practices became part of an important debate that had a bearing not only on what it meant to be a professional artist but also on what it meant to be masculine or feminine. An exploration of such connections provides the possibility to gain an insight into the emergence of a society that is governed by adherents to the professional ideal. The position that this thesis takes in relationship to Pre-Raphaelitism is one that tries to recognise the value and the radical nature of their artistic production. While interest in the Pre-Raphaelites has grown since the 1970s, the revaluation of their work has always been qualified by an ultimate recognition of their failure as a modern artistic movement. This dissertation attempts to qualify that judgement and to add to the debate on the cultural rôle of the Pre-Raphaelites by recognising their reforming intentions and by establishing a significant social purpose in their art. It is in the representation of women and sexuality that the Pre-Raphaelites – most especially Rossetti – find the necessary, if notional, distance from which to criticise bourgeois life and standards.

Although much of the artistic and professional practice that I have identified has been analysed by other researchers, the topics covered in each chapter have not previously been unified in any systematic way. In this thesis, the significance of gender and sexuality, both as attributes of the artist and the subject of art, has been tested as a professionally productive practice. The ideological construction of woman and her sexuality simultaneously provided professional artists with a model for their own relationship to the marketplace in the figure of the whore – characterised by Rossetti as involved in material transactions but inwardly pure and uninvolved – and a platform from which to offer a critique of the middle class. The conventional middle class ideology of the good and the bad woman, one all virtue the other all vice, was one that the artist could attack from a position of greater insight. By considering the exploitation of gender and sexuality as a vocational strategy and by tracing the development of other ancillary activities such as art reviewing and art exhibiting with the same critical model, I have made a distinct survey that considers a variety of activities and institutions not before covered in the same study.

Notes to Introduction

¹ For the etymology of professional and professionalism, see the Oxford English Dictionary, second edition on compact disc for IBM PC (Oxford: OUP, 1992).

² Julie F. Codell, 'Marion Harry Spielmann and the Role of the Press in the Professionalization of Artists', Victorian Periodical Review 22:1 (spring 1989), 7.

³ 'The Fine Arts Quarterly Review and Artpolitics in the 1860s', Victorian Periodical Review 23:3 (fall 1990), 95.

⁴ Ian Fletcher, *Union and Beauty: the examination of some 19th century minority periodicals*, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Reading University, 1965, 82.

⁵ Frank Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities: medico-moral politics in England from 1830* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), 51.

⁶ Harold Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society* (London: Routledge, 1969), 320.

⁷ Raymond Williams, *Culture* (London: Fontana, 1981), 33–86.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 74.

⁹ Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850–1930* (Oxford: OUP, 1991), 60–90.

¹⁰ T. W. Heyck, *The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England* (London: Croom Helm, 1982), 225.

1 Art, Work and the Professional Ideal

They [the professionals] were the forgotten middle class, in short, because they forgot themselves.

Harold Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society (1969).¹

In this chapter, I will first establish the nature of professionalism and the professional ideal and its relationship to middle-class masculinity. I will then consider how such fractional class analysis can provide insight into the production and practices of Pre-Raphaelitism. The task of establishing the specifics of my argument will be served by identifying how they relate to the practices of one artist involved in the execution and marketing of one painting. The choice of artist and painting is not intended to act as a paradigm of Pre-Raphaelite production and consumption but rather to indicate the problems of interpretation around masculinity and professionalism that are being addressed. In selecting Ford Madox Brown's Work, first exhibited in 1865, I have intentionally chosen a painting that has become identified as an icon of Pre-Raphaelitism and the Victorian middle-class. So various is Pre-Raphaelitism, both in style and intention, that representing any painting as typical would almost certainly be contentious. Brown's painting is neither literary nor medieval in style or in subject matter, it offers no interpretation of a dream-world, and does not represent a romantic and ideal past. Nor, for that matter, was Brown a member of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. The influence of Pre-Raphaelitism grew to extend far beyond any of these boundaries and classifications. I will examine the ways in

which Work was received by its contemporary audience both in terms of its production and content and in the display and presentation of the painting. Work presents an important indication of the way in which one mid-Victorian painter viewed his function as a cultural practitioner. The painting provides evidence of Brown's attempts to establish professional status in a painting that considers issues of class and gender. While Brown's own commentary on the painting is silent on the nature of 'artwork', it should be clear that a painting that has as its subject matter an interpretation of that artist's view of work must also involve that artist's ideas about his occupation, a case that I will be arguing later in the chapter. The detail and complex activity that Brown packed into the small area of the painting, have tended to encourage a largely uncritical acceptance of his own interpretation of the iconographic intent of this detail and activity. Work and Brown's own extensive commentary on the painting have achieved an almost inviolable symbiosis that has served at once to legitimise the status of Work and over-interpret that which it represents.

I

What did the terms 'professional' and 'professionalism' mean to a practising Pre-Raphaelite painter? Our understanding of the terms 'professional' and 'professionalism' and that of the mid-nineteenth century is at once the same and different. Like the mid-Victorians we associate the term 'profession' with certain vocations and types of work, although our classifications would be more extensive than those current in the 1850s. There was also a sense in which the word was seen to differentiate between those paid for performing and those who were amateurs. As early as 1811 Jane Austen wrote, 'There is to be some very good music – five professionals, . . . besides amateurs'.² We already have the idea

here that the professional can be expected to perform more skilfully than the amateur. But by the mid-nineteenth century many writers and observers were concerned with what actually constituted a profession, and in 1839 F. D. Maurice, founder of the Working Men's College, wrote:

Profession in our country. . . is expressly that kind of business which deals primarily with men as men, and is thus distinguished from a Trade, which provides for the external wants or occasions of men.³

As we can see, this provides an open-ended definition of what constitutes a profession, one that would certainly include educators and, one would think, painters. At the same time, even an established profession like medicine was under pressure to conform to a changing pattern of acceptable practice. In terms of Maurice's definition, it was becoming a question not only of what a profession dealt with, but the way in which it dealt with it. This is central to the developing professional ideal. Not only was the professional to deal with his fellow man, but he was to deal with him in an efficient, altruistic and honourable way.

Those callings that could be seen to deal with men as modern men, and so deal with them in a modern manner, began to gain in prestige. An example of what that manner might be can be found in the case of medicine which was able to establish itself as the sole learned profession to enjoy both a scientific basis and an apparent concern with the well being of its fellow men. Frank Mort defines a modern scientific practice as increasingly identifying professional middle-class masculinity.⁴ But a strictly scientific basis clearly could not apply to all middle-class occupations. Rather, clear scientific thought, intolerance of the dilettante and the desire to improve society were seen as the true aim of the modern middle-class male Victorian in the 1840s and 50s. T. W. Heyck sees the scientific

professional model, however, as the one which most affects the formation of intellectual life during the second half of the nineteenth century. Heyck's interpretation is significant in two major respects as a way of interpreting the development of the modern art world: the identification of specialisation as an important criterion of professionalism and the emphasis on research for its own sake without the intrusion of commercial considerations.⁵ Both of these tendencies can be identified as contributing to changes in the way the roles of the artist, critic and dealer develop during the nineteenth century. The hard-edged scientific middle-class male gave way to a model that was concerned with social improvement and the human situation. But while the defining interest of the middle-class professional might be women, children and the poor, they were not the defining characteristic. Professionalism, as far as the middle class was concerned, was very much a case of men dealing with men, and the way that this was done can be seen as defining an emergent Victorian masculinity.

II

The specific nature of the ideological change that takes place in the intellectual fraction of the middle class during the second half of the nineteenth century is explored by Harold Perkin. In The Rise of Professional Society: England since 1880, Perkin puts forward a persuasive model of professionalism and its role in society. In many ways this model of professionalism helps to explain practices and attitudes developing in and around the work of critics and artists, like John Ruskin and Ford Madox Brown, who were associated with Pre-Raphaelitism. Perkin suggests that in the twentieth century it is the professions and the ideology of professionalism that replaces the hegemony enjoyed by industrial and commercial capital and the ideology of the free-market in Victorian Britain. In

fact, he argues that modern industry and business are not an extension of Victorian capitalism but belong to a society governed by the 'human capital' of the professional. Professionalism can be viewed as the response of the educated classes to the rise of the hegemony of capital. It is at once a reaction against the privileged amateur of the eighteenth century and a response to the scientific, political and philosophical ideas which that century had generated. The decline of aristocratic patronage that had funded much of the intellectual production in 'old society' was replaced by a system based on an ideal of objective measures of ability, specialisation and career structures.

Perkin's thesis would appear to suggest that professionalism is far more than a certain attitude to the way that one earns one's living. What Perkin is saying, in effect, is that the ideology of the professional is the 'dominant ideology' of the early and mid-twentieth century. If this is the case, then 'professionalism' is the 'emerging ideology' in Raymond Williams's terms, during the period of capitalist hegemony. Perkin's normative professionals tend to be civil servants and other civic employees, like nurses and teachers, and the managers and related professionals in the private sector. In particular, he would appear to find the artist a difficult case to classify, although he finds artists in general useful in exemplifying how the skill of the professional is converted into property in the sense that his skill produces within the person of the professional an identifiable 'rent' value:

A natural or 'accidental' example, the fortuitous result of a unique though professionally trained voice, is that of Placido Domingo, who is paid a very large fee for each performance, most of which is rent for the

use of the scarce resource, or a Henry Moore sculpture, which is a lump of stone transformed in value by his signature.⁶

Perkin's inability here to perceive the artist as a legitimate professional, yet exemplary of the professional's economic justification should, perhaps, have alerted him to the ideological nature of the artist's rôle within the professional ideal. It is perhaps a truism of cultural analysis that whenever something appears 'natural' and unexplainable then we are operating within an area where fundamental values have been internalised. Certainly, I feel that the forces that seem to define professionalism in the twentieth-century account for many developments in British and European art from the 1850s. Placido Domingo or Henry Moore are no more natural or accidental than a QC, physicist, or footballer at the top of his or her profession. That Perkin should think they are suggests that the artist fulfils a symbolic role in the ideology of professionalism. The artist has come to be seen as separated from the ordinary transactions of commerce. Nevertheless, Perkin's thesis on the rise of professional society offers a way of understanding the nature of the production and consumption of art during the modern period and that artists were at the forefront of the ideological changes situated around professionalism.

The figure of the artist, in relation to the professional and professionalism, depends on a special status. This status is created by the perceived rarity of special talent. During the first half of the nineteenth century such talent was characterised as 'genius'.⁷ As Perkin points out:

The evolution of the romantic conception of genius deserves an unromantic monograph, but meanwhile it can be said that the romantic

movement represents a social emancipation of the intellectual and the artist exactly parallel to the birth of class.⁸

Christine Battersby in Gender and Genius (1989) makes the point that the Romantic construction of genius is also heavily gendered and supports the patriarchal nature of middle-class hegemony. Interestingly, in terms of this discussion, Battersby identifies it as a Romantic belief that genius was feminine or, at least, androgynous. It was the special talent of the genius to be able to convert the femininity in his soul into great art. Although the nineteenth-century artist's genius was essentially 'feminine', the hot, dry fire of masculinity was required to realise great art. In Battersby's words, the 'Romantics' androgyne has male genital organs; it is only his soul that is "feminine".⁹ The artistic 'genius' comes to provide for professional society a 'natural' example of what the more ordinary (and manly) professional achieves with talent and education. While 'old' society was based on the ownership of land and 'new' society on the ownership of capital, professional society was based on human capital. Modern professionalism becomes viable through the success of the artist to establish the ideal of what that human capital or self-property might be. Perkin writes:

In industrial society even actors and playwrights like Sheridan, Ellen Terry and Bernard Shaw turned human capital into visible wealth. But only in post-industrial society have the professions as a whole been able to establish human capital as the dominant form of wealth.¹⁰

The concept of self-property is central to the bourgeois romantic belief in the importance and sanctity of the individual. It is interesting to note that early evidence of the concept of the individual is linked closely to homosexuality. Let me give a couple of examples to explain this point. In England, an important

historical event that helped to create the idea of the individual was the Civil War. Christopher Hill notes a change in the attitude to the body between the Sixteenth and late seventeenth century. The statutes of 1533 and 1563 had been directed against forbidden sexual practices, such as sodomy, that were forbidden in the Bible. Such acts were not associated with a particular type of person or sexuality. In the seventeenth century the attitude to a person committing the act marked the 'emergence of that concern with the individual and the particular which is peculiarly modern.' Hill cites (from Alan Bray's work) the case of a man arrested in 1726 for alleged sexual acts with another man. He said in reply to the charge: 'I did it because I thought I knew him, and I think there is no crime in making what use I please of my own body'.¹¹

While the development of individual sexuality had clearly begun, in so far as the individual was identifying his/her body as an area of private concern, the identification of the homosexual as having an identifiable and different sexuality from some prescribed norm had to wait until the latter part of the nineteenth century and the work of the sexologists. Indeed, Michel Foucault cites 'Westphal's famous article of 1870 [a date that coincides interestingly with the rise of criticism that accuses Pre-Raphaelitism of effeminacy] on "contrary sexual sensations" as the point at which homosexuality becomes a manifestation of an individual's psychological and sexual history.¹² Yet it is clear that the period that separated the Civil War and 1726 had seen a revolution of more than Parliament. The idea of the individual had emerged from the democratic experiments of the Commonwealth chemistry set. The Leveller Richard Overton, in claiming the political rights of the individual said 'every one as he is himself, so he hath a self-property, else could he not be himself'.¹³

The idea of the individual as property, then, is neither an invention of Perkin's nor of the professional ideal, yet it is central to it because it generates, through the example of genius, the rent value of professional services. Perkin writes: 'Property is not, as is commonly believed, an object or a credit instrument, which are just its outward signs'. Rather property means the control of a resource, a political and economic relationship within society. Property is the right to command an income be it 'rent, interest, profits, labour service, or goods in kind'.¹⁴ The identification of the individual as property is clearly important in establishing the professional ideal as a class ideal. It identifies that group with a means of production that is separate from that of land, capital and labour. The source of the value that society then gives to the professional individual is bound up with ideas of property and genius. But the value of genius is in its rarity because it is a 'natural' resource. While professional society may be based on the value given to genius, like the gold standard, it cannot adulterate it. Instead, in less 'natural' professions, it enforces a lengthy training that, perhaps not accidentally, is similar to the quest of a gallant knight. Perkin argues that the professional exists by convincing the rest of society that there is an equitable validity in his or her claims. A natural justice which recognises the need to reward 'expert service based on selection by merit and long, arduous training'. The importance of professional people to society, according to this argument, is that they are themselves 'above the main economic battle, at once privileged observers and benevolent neutrals'. This belief, rightly or wrongly, is based on the professionals' own confidence in society's need for their services since, 'whichever side wins, they believe that their services will be necessary and properly rewarded'.¹⁵

Central to this system of reward was the destruction of 'Old Corruption', the network of interest and favour that had formed the method of preferment in the aristocratic government. Aristocratic patronage had been overturned by the success of the entrepreneurial ideal which promoted competition and the free market bringing with it the symbiotic and emerging professional ideal. The professional ideal, however, did not submit to the same judgement of the market place as, 'merit meant ability and diligence in one's chosen field of expertise, and could be judged only by other professional experts in the same field'.¹⁶ So at the point where we see industrial society apparently victorious in the 1840s, achieving actual, if not nominal, control of government, we can also discern the emergence of the 'forgotten middle class' dedicated to service rather than profit.

Perkin is not the only commentator to view the professional fraction of the middle class with interest. Robert Gray has noted the importance of the 'urban gentry' in establishing the hegemony of the bourgeoisie. He describes these individuals as being particularly concerned in 'administrative and ideological organisations of society'. While the term 'urban gentry' might suggest something different from Perkin's professionals, they are in fact the same individuals, 'members of statistical societies and Royal Commissions, writers and readers of the quarterly press, organisers of charity and social discipline'.¹⁷ R. S. Neale has written at some length on the inadequacies of the three class model of society. In Class and Ideology in the Nineteenth Century, he proposes a five class model that divides the working class in two and introduces a middling class between working class A, the skilled artisans, and the capitalist middle classes. It was this middling class that, with working class A, formed the radical edge of reform in the nineteenth century, as activists in both the Anti-Corn Law League and the

Chartist movement. While it included the small shopkeeper and managerial employees, this middling class was also home of the educated fractions that contained the lower bands of professional society. This model gives only partial support to Perkin's own four class model. However, it does provide an important class connection between the growing middling class employees and small owners and the ideal of professionalism. It was from that fraction of society that many Victorian artists and intellectuals emerged, including important members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood.¹⁸

The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood played on a public stage in a society where the meaning of public and private individuals was being transformed. In The Fall of Public Man, Richard Sennett provides ways of analysing social change between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which, while not independent of class, allows a fresh dimension to be considered. The social changes that Sennett explores are caused by a breakdown in traditional class relationships and recognition. Sennett compares the world of the developing cosmopolitan city (in effect, London and Paris) and its public life to that of the theatre. He argues that the conventions of dress and personal display on the eighteenth-century city street allow a relatively understandable social intercourse to take place between citizens who are inevitably strangers. The pressures of social change, then, convert the citizen from a public actor to a private personality. Increasingly during the nineteenth century the individual attempts to control what can be read of their personality from their public display. Yet the art and science of the period (as in the case of Brown's Work and his commentary on it) emphasise the importance of minute detail in the infallible reading of the intellect, character and morality of the individual. The Victorian realist novel attempts to make the

individual transparent through the use of significant detail 'whereby we share the intimate thoughts of a single character' and are at the same time aware of a larger reality.¹⁹ The Pre-Raphaelite artist uses detail in an attempt to fix the narrative meaning to overemphasise the significance in each small fact, seeking to determine the reading of the painting's overall appearance.

Similarly, Sennett maintains, individuals try to control the details of their clothing and demeanour to give nothing away, and so flamboyance becomes the preserve of the licensed outsiders, the actors and artists. In this way, the individual and the individualist become the representatives of the new society, the personal and the private being expressions of the death of old society. Sennett's work, then, emerges as the psychological social history of the change that Perkin imagines. The cosmopolitan city robbed old society of the knowledge that perpetuated its power which rested in the ability to recognise those whose loyalty to that society deserved favour and preferment. However, according to Perkin, it was failure to maintain loyalty to its own tradition in the countryside that ultimately destroyed old society. In Perkin's view, the loyalties and obligations to old society died not because of middle-class agitation but because of aristocratic betrayal. In short, old society died because of the landowners' growing unwillingness to meet their traditional obligations to the lower orders. The old laws which set wage levels and poor rates were abandoned or rewritten to the advantage of the landlords. The general movement towards the hard rules of utility in the early part of the century made the entrepreneurial ideal hard to resist, but the logic of Utilitarianism was also instrumental in the emergence of professional society; Perkin points to the example of J. S. Mill. The life and work of Mill provide us with strong evidence of ideological change within the

intellectual middle class and additional research has helped to open up the nature of that change.

In his book Public Moralists, Collini promotes a much closer link between the intellectual idealists of professionalism and professional artists. According to Collini, John Stuart Mill is typical of those intellectuals who moved from the stark Utilitarianism of the early part of the century to what Collini calls the 'culture of altruism'.²⁰ Increasingly the moral dimensions of political economy rejected selfishness for service to others and it was through aesthetic appreciation that this morality was to be promoted. In his book Collini cites Mill's Inaugural Address of 1867 as evidence of the relationship between aesthetic sensibility and the new altruism:

there are few capable of feeling the sublimer order of natural beauty . . . who are not, at least temporarily, raised above the littleness of humanity and made to feel the puerility of the petty objects which set men's interests at variance, contrasted with the nobler pleasures which all might share.²¹

The public moralists, with their doctrine of altruism and work, began to view imaginative art as the ideal form in which to promote a moral sense.²² While it was literature that seemed to offer the most direct link between the moralists and those in need of instruction the visual artist, with his ability to reproduce the appearance of 'Nature', also had a rôle to play.

The position of the artist, then, in relation to the development of the professional ideal, is far from an 'accidental' one. While Perkin may see the creative professional as symbolising the essential nature of the individual's rent value, Collini suggests that the artist was involved as an active professional in

promoting the professional ideal. However, while the artist in Victorian Britain might have been envisaged as the promoter of an altruistic moral regeneration, he eventually comes to personify it. The development of artistic practice from Pre-Raphaelitism to Aestheticism illustrates the growth and changes in the professional ideal. From an initial interest in establishing the artist as a modern professional with specialist skills and moral interests, as demonstrated in the picture he produces – we move to the artist himself as constituting his most important professional production. The artist, as a specially gifted individual, becomes a commodity that represents to professional society a paradigm of the professional ideal. How, then, did this change in middle-class ideology come about?

In the 1850s the entrepreneurial ideal seemed to offer to its professional apologists the social progress they craved. Middle-class certainty was made visible by the smoke and endless activity, and justified by efficiency and facts. Those facts themselves were much more than information, they were small truths that would accumulate inevitably into one great Truth. And at first professionalism was allied with that hard-edged activity. All middle-class occupations aimed to establish a greater degree of professionalism based on science, empiricism and moral certainty. But as the century developed, the professionals began to see that unfettered enterprise had victims as well as victors. Professionalism then began to separate itself from the simple pursuit of profit and sought to act to temper the effects of that pursuit. Professionals began to distance themselves from mere money making and, in this way, the betrayed aristocratic ideal of service was born again in a sort of top-hatted knight errantry fostered by the public schools and universities. In Robert Gray's words:

the definition of 'genteel' professional status and qualifications, and the associated transformation and growth of high prestige educational institutions, were important developments of the period, forming hierarchies of intellectuals, but at the same time fostering their cohesion on a 'professional' basis.²³

The professional fraction of the middle class, initially the intellectuals and apologists for the commercial middle class, now needed apologists of their own.

Professionals wished to establish a critique of capitalism to explain and justify their involvement within commerce while maintaining their right to judge and mitigate capital's effects. It is the person of the artist that comes to guarantee the disinterested judgement—is, in fact, the moral underwriter—of the professional class. The artist is increasingly perceived by the middle class as unworldly. Art becomes a vocation that is enriched by hardship, rather than pursued in spite of it. In short, the Romantic artist replaces the monk and nun as guardian of the human soul. In doing so, the artist helps to create a form of sanctity for the secular clerics of the professional middle-class. While Pre-Raphaelitism begins with an appreciation of the importance of making a living, and the dimensions of that living as a measure of success, such simple material values are overtaken as the century progresses. So by 1900 the most financially successful of the original Brotherhood, Millais, is seen as the betrayer of 'Art'. Rossetti, on the other hand, who was imprudent when in funds and dependent on the generosity of friends and relatives when short of 'tin', represents the new unworldly ideal of the professional artist. Yet Rossetti, according to his brother, was far from unworldly. When editing his brother's correspondence, William Michael Rossetti regrets the 'very frequent mention of prices charged and paid'. In

explaining and excusing his brother's only too worldly interest in money, W. M. Rossetti added that 'a professional man acts professionally'.²⁴ Here, W. M. Rossetti is using the term 'professional' to describe the necessary interest in market and money that the middle-class man engaged in earning a living must show. W. M. Rossetti himself represented what the professional man was becoming. He is embarrassed by crude talk of money and money-making—and is estranged from the entrepreneurial ideal which had once seemed to promise everything.

Indeed, it is the critic, as in the case of W. M. Rossetti and D. G. Rossetti, who acts as the interpreter for both artist and artwork in their relationship with the professional ideal and professional society. As the artist endeavoured to shake off the stigma of an involvement in entrepreneurial trade, the specialisation of the critic, and to an extent the art dealer, became the channels through which the world viewed the artist. The critic and the dealer served to separate the economic factors of the production of artwork from those of its consumption. In this way a critical distance could be achieved between the ideological creation of professionalism, in the person of the artist, and the involvement of the professional in modifying and ordering entrepreneurial society. This ideological distancing allowed the professional to serve as an apparently disinterested critic of the entrepreneur's pursuit of profit at all costs. Even the way in which an artist lived became exemplary of his commitment to a new kind of professionalism.

A 'professional' masculinity can only exist if there also exists some 'other' or 'others' to establish its polarity of meaning. It is now almost a truism that Victorian ideology constructed middle-class gender in terms of the two 'separate spheres' of influence, that of the woman in the home and that of the man out in

the world of business. Such a separation of home and business, while an ideal often assumed in household manuals, was far from universal. The census of 1851 showed that the greatest number of middle-class families lived on the premises of their business or very near it.²⁵ It is not until much later in the century that the suburban villa achieves a more widespread separation of spheres. Even then a substantial fraction of middle-class professionals had little option but to live over the 'shop'. It was usual in the established older professions of medicine and church to work from home and wives played an active part in the pursuit of their husband's profession. While it may be true that the middle-class male, during the nineteenth century, increasingly measured his success on a separation of interests 'organised around an increasingly rigid division between the public world of professional life and the private sphere of women, home and domesticity', we might interpret this, not as a norm but rather as a strategy to establish professional masculinity where that identity may have been in question—as in the newer professions like civil engineering, or in those that had been linked to trade, like that of the surgeon.²⁶

For the artist certainly, such rigid separation of spheres was rarely possible; his home was often his 'shop'. A lack of such separation would not necessarily affect the way a painter perceived his professional and masculine status. Throughout their careers the painters principally associated with the PRB—Hunt, Millais, Rossetti and Burne-Jones—used friends and family as models for subject paintings. Such intimacy offered support in maintaining the artist's professional masculinity through close proximity to dependent 'others'. Yet, if domesticity supported the artist's masculinity, it did not create it. The artist's professional status had to be established through his work and a perceived

measure of success within the existing conditions of cultural production. The problem for the artist, in common with other fractions of the middle classes, was that the nature of his 'business', in terms of the status it provided and the economy that operated it, was changing. What is interesting to note is the increasing incidence of successful artists building homes with large and imposing studios. This was true of Academic artists and those associated with Pre-Raphaelitism alike.

In his recent Artists' Houses in London 1764–1914 (1994), Giles Walkley states that in London alone some 1300 domestic artists' studios were built between the 1850s and the First World War.²⁷ Although this urge to build reached the proportions of a 'craze', the underlying imperative, as Walkley says, was 'the rise of professionalism among artists'.²⁸ That the pressure to appear as a professional was considerable is testified to by the scale of some of these domestic studios. Both in size and decoration many of the studios built exceeded greatly, in ambition and grandeur, the talent and career expectations of their inhabitants. The studio had become not only a place with enough space and light to work and perhaps to display paintings seeking purchasers, but also becomes a public setting for the artist and a frame for his genius. Members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood were not slow to acquire such professional settings, as early as 1856 Holman Hunt rented 1 Tor Villas from James Clarke Hook ARA, who had built the studio-house in 1851. Hunt shared the facilities with two other would be Pre-Raphaelites, Michael Halliday and Robert Martineau.²⁹ The nineteenth-century artist's home and studio, then, had a relationship to the market for art that was different from that of his eighteenth-century counterpart. Rather than merely

providing accommodation for the work of the artist and his assistants, the artist's studio was becoming an expression of his professionalism.

The institutions and practices of eighteenth-century art, apart from their suspect 'aristocratic' pedigree, did not provide the artist with a suitable means to establish his status, professionalism and security. The system of patronage that would ensure the status of the artist before he was established had almost atrophied by the mid-nineteenth century, and was anyway suspect in the eyes of the middle classes. High status History painting was nearly unsaleable; saleable 'genre' paintings and their painters enjoyed lower professional status. That something needed to be done about the state of British Art was agreed by all those who cared. It was into this context that the debate on Pre-Raphaelitism emerged. The Pre-Raphaelites and Pre-Raphaelitism established, in some cases voluntarily and in others not, a cultural practice that began to establish a new relationship between the artist and the art market.

III

How might one set about discussing Pre-Raphaelitism and professionalism? Pre-Raphaelitism seems to be shrouded in a cosy English amateurism, a drawing-room rebellion that had no real relevance to the development of the modern professional artist. The moment of the Brotherhood was brief, and the direct influence of Pre-Raphaelitism at one time seemed confined to Victorian Britain and the United States. After the neglect of Modernist art critics, the reclamation of the Pre-Raphaelites began with William Gaunt's The Pre-Raphaelite Tragedy (1942), where the influence of the Pre-Raphaelites on members of the Symbolist and Surrealist schools was established. But Gaunt was careful not to claim Pre-Raphaelitism for the mainstream of Modern art. According to Gaunt the Pre-

Raphaelites did not 'arise from a preceding tradition' but were 'an artificial revival'.³⁰ While Pre-Raphaelitism did self-consciously appropriate the Italian primitive art, it was an intellectual appropriation rather than a stylistic one. Stylistically the Brotherhood perhaps owed more to the spiritual revival instigated by the German Nazarenes, itself another 'artificial' revival of the principles of Dürer and Raphael. (Called Nazarenes because of their long hair and beards, this group included Peter Cornelius, Johann Friedrich Overbeck, and Franz Pforr. Converts to Catholicism, these German artists were active in Rome after 1810. The influence of this group was most evident in the religious work of William Dyce.) Although Gaunt probably had an idea of what a 'natural' revival might be, that idea was based on an a 'progressive' ideology of culture. Pre-Raphaelitism, in Gaunt's words, represented a 'break' in the 'orderly growth' of British involvement in the natural development of European painting. Although Gaunt admitted the Pre-Raphaelite rebellion against the conventions and institutions of their day, the Brotherhood has been stigmatised by the Modern Art establishment, as well as by the conservative critics of their own day, as 'wrong headed'.

The nineteenth-century revolution in art—what Roger Fry termed 'the unequal struggle . . . [to establish] the idea of the freedom of art from all trammels and tyrannies'—is seen largely as an autonomous revolt centred on technique and style.³¹ Fry sees art as being 'freed' from the very moral and literal imperatives that Pre-Raphaelitism seems to delight in. Stephen Spender, in 1945, encapsulated the generally accepted failure of the Pre-Raphaelites in the revolutionary stakes in the following words: 'they lacked the new vision of nature which gave such energy to the French Impressionists'.³² The PRB certainly considered a 'new vision

of nature' as one of their principal aims and the mobilisation of this 'vision' as a major weapon in their fight against academic convention. However, the Pre-Raphaelite vision of nature was not one that fitted the modernist model of technical 'progress'. A more recent study, Nineteenth Century Art (1994), undertaken in the spirit of the 'new' art history, locates Pre-Raphaelitism within the general concerns of contemporary European art. The PRB are placed within the debate on realism and the emergence of the avant-garde, and, as the authors point out, Millais's realism was being condemned as ugly in London at the same time as Courbet's work was being identified in a similar way in Paris.³³ Yet for the critics of the first half of the twentieth century, it was the style of the Impressionists that seemed to offer the possibility of a critique of capitalism, a progressive potential, an engagement with progress that the apparently backward looking and historicist Pre-Raphaelites had almost wilfully, given the example of Turner, avoided. It is hardly surprising that following the nature of the attention the Pre-Raphaelites received in the 1940s they had longer to wait for a systematic re-evaluation of their contribution to British art.

Timothy Hilton's study of the Pre-Raphaelite movement, published in 1970, was a result of growing commercial and academic interest in the Pre-Raphaelites. The author claimed his was the first survey devoted to Pre-Raphaelite painting since Percy Bate's book of 1899. While Hilton admits in the preface that some of his 'conclusions are necessarily tentative' due to the paucity of scholarly debate, he feels that his work represents some 'adjustments' to the verdict of art history.³⁴ In fact Hilton's book was just the beginning of a serious review of the Pre-Raphaelites. The Tate Gallery's important 1984 exhibition of Pre-Raphaelite painting was the significant culmination of two decades of

involvement by the art establishment in what had been a neglected group of Victorian painters. The Tate exhibition was received with some enthusiasm, as Allen Staley's review in the Burlington Magazine testifies. Staley describes the exhibition as the 'largest, the most comprehensive, and, quite simply, the best exhibition of Pre-Raphaelite painting that has ever taken place (and almost certainly that ever will)'.³⁵ The exhibition was presented in a chronological form that emphasised the contribution of Rossetti. The latest date for works selected of 1882, the year of Rossetti's death, excluded some of Burne-Jones's better known works and fostered the belief that Pre-Raphaelitism and 'Rossettianism' (as Millais called it) were synonymous.³⁶

Between 1970 and 1984 the traditional concerns of art history that had resulted in a model of a linear progress culminating in Modernism were being questioned by a new generation of art historians. Informed by feminism and Marxist materialism, Deborah Cherry and Griselda Pollock identified 1961 as the year that marked the beginning of renewed mainstream academic interest in Pre-Raphaelite painters. In that year Jeremy Maas staged the first commercial Pre-Raphaelite exhibition in his newly opened London gallery. Sparked by 'a massive appreciation in the value of Pre-Raphaelite works as commodities on the art market' in that year, enthusiasm for Pre-Raphaelite painting had steadily grown.³⁷ As well as the academic interest in Pre-Raphaelitism there was also a steady growth in popular approval associated with the growth of 'flower power'. However, Cherry and Pollock point out that the 'beautiful young people' who visited Maas's gallery were largely the young professional middle class whose taste for things Victorian was already becoming evident in the success of Laura Ashley and in Sanderson's reissue of William Morris wallpapers.

The Tate exhibition, reflecting the enhanced market value occasioned by academic and popular interest in Pre-Raphaelite art, also marks the beginning of a growing interest in Pre-Raphaelite art from critics and historians involved in alternative approaches to art criticism. These analytical strategies tended to concentrate on the social history of art and its implications for contemporary critical issues, especially feminist art history. Much of the work done on the Pre-Raphaelites since the 1970s has been concerned with rereading their works as patriarchal texts. Centring on the production of representations of women for the enjoyment of men, feminist critics have exposed what Lynne Pearce calls the 'sexism, misogyny and pornography' in Pre-Raphaelite art.³⁸ Such readings rely on a complex and sensitive use of various tools and indicators, what Marcia Pointon, in Pre-Raphaelites re-viewed, defines as 'cultural materialism'. This is a critical methodology that grew from the 'challenging discourses of Marxism, feminism, structuralism, psychoanalysis and poststructuralism . . . juxtaposed with work not customarily accorded literary or artistic standing.' Such a methodology, Pointon observes, is a 'combination of historical and cultural context, theoretical method, political commitment and textual analysis'.³⁹ While I believe that such feminist readings have provided a stimulating way of approaching Pre-Raphaelite art, they do tend to suppose a very close identification of Pre-Raphaelite production with the dominant ideology of the middle class. What has been less explored are the terms of the relationship between Pre-Raphaelitism and a less unified set of Victorian middle-class ideologies.

IV

The relationship between Pre-Raphaelite art and middle-class ideology is best tested on an example of artistic production which self-consciously deals with matters of class. From the moment that W. M. Rossetti first praised the artist, in 1865, for his detailed explanation, the critical response to Work (Plate 1) has been largely directed by Brown's text. Yet does Brown's written account exhaust the meaning in the painting? Brown's commentary seeks at once to clarify and to control readings of his painting. Whatever Brown's motives the fact of his description of Work raises certain questions. Is Brown seeking to establish interpretational control as a professional concern? During a period when the meaning of professionalism was changing to include high-minded altruism and a growing emphasis on art, especially literature, as a medium for promoting such altruism, does Brown's commentary reflect a painter's claim for the importance of his own art as a conduit for social improvement?

It was to the raising of the social standing of the artist, of course, that the Royal Academy was largely dedicated. There can be little doubt that, since the Academy's institution in 1768, it had been reasonably successful in so doing. But the status of the artist in the Royal Academy was firmly based in an outmoded professional practice, in the high value it set on History painting, in the length and nature of academic training, and in its methods of selecting and hanging work for exhibition. But the dominance of History painting had been undermined by the development of sub-genres such as Turner's history landscape, and, perhaps more importantly in the context of Victorian and Pre-Raphaelite painting, Sir David Wilkie's 'historical genre' painting. Conventional History painting enjoyed an elevated status that was not reflected in patronage or sales.⁴⁰ It was a

changing art world, however, that produced the Pre-Raphaelites, and Ford Madox Brown, perhaps more than any other artist associated with the movement, despised the methods and prejudices of the Royal Academy. Brown's firm belief in the virtue of the middle class would tend to predispose him to reject an institution founded in the tradition of eighteenth-century aristocratic patronage. Indeed, although History painting enjoyed high status in the eighteenth century it was from portraiture that most artists earned their living.

Hilton, in The Pre-Raphaelites, points to a significant implicit concern of the painting that is related to the development of Pre-Raphaelitism itself: 'the relationship of art to work'. He cites the attitude common at the beginning of the nineteenth century exemplified by Charles Collins's father, William, who made the following revealing remark to his friend Benjamin Robert Haydon: 'Depend upon it, Sir, were it not for the Royal Academy we should all be treated as carpenters'.⁴¹ Hilton sees Collins's concern with the 'dignity of his profession', contrasting with the development of artistic attitudes through the writings of first John Ruskin and later William Morris. Ruskin sees a relationship between the industry involved in a piece of artwork and its value. The critic's ideas on the proper purpose and practice of art were, according to Hilton, initially suggested in a muddled way in the first volume of Modern Painters. Ruskin developed his ideas on what he called 'the political economy of Art' in two lectures given in Manchester in 1857 at the time of that city's 'Art Treasures' exhibition. In these lectures he tries to develop the correct balance between cost and quality.

Although Ruskin believes art should be available as cheaply as possible, he maintains that it 'can't be cheap beyond a certain point'.⁴² For art that is cheaply done in cheap materials will not last. Such work will be thrown out and replaced

by similar 'cheap' work. Good work takes time and the best materials, so 'perfect work cannot be hurried'.⁴³ Ruskin, then, sets the value of a painting at the cost of production. In other words, if a good drawing by a talented artist takes six days to produce, then its cheapest cost must be providing the necessities of life for six days, plus the cost of the best materials to produce the work. This tendency, Hilton suggests, is developed further by Morris and the Arts and Crafts movement, which emphasised 'art-work', a significantly hyphenated term. Rather than placing the emphasis on the finished 'artwork', art-work by contrast promotes the process that produces the completed artefact.⁴⁴ The virtue of the chair or fabric or painting does not reside only in surface attractiveness, but rather in the quality of the time, skill and thought that has gone into producing it. The ideal of the true 'art-work' is that, although it may cost more than mass-produced 'art', its cost reflects the true price of its production in terms of labour and materials. Once the Academy as a 'meaningful centre of artistic activity' has been discounted, Morris can assert that artists are 'just like carpenters': no real distinction between them can be assumed because 'art and work should be one and the same thing'.⁴⁵ Ruskin's beliefs on how the value was produced in art, by what Samuel Smiles called 'laborious industry' led him, according to Herbert Sussman, into conflict with alternative professional evaluations later in the century.⁴⁶ When Ruskin charged Whistler 'that the time spent by the artist in production did not justify the price demanded', Whistler's reply, that the picture represented 'the knowledge of a lifetime', was very much in the spirit of modern professionalism.⁴⁷

The assertions that Morris makes imply a lessening of the status of the artist and his profession. Although Hilton is right in believing that Brown shared

similar beliefs and that these colour his approach to the subject of work, I will show that such beliefs are superseded by fundamental changes in attitudes to art as a profession. Indeed, the integration of the practical and manual aspects of the artist's work reflect an involvement with the formation of a professional ideal and the consciousness of an emerging fraction of the middle class. Let me give an example of what I mean. In his diary, Brown writes that 'work to the best of one's power is never waste'.⁴⁸ In its published form, the whole diary is a detailed record of the hours that Brown spent at each particular part of his labour. It is significant that Brown identifies not only the time spent in the practical and manual aspects of his labour, but also on the cognitive and administrative tasks involved in his cultural production. The artist's most active period in terms of important work and the promotion of it is covered by this diary. The diary itemises each function that the painter performed in the execution of his art and enabled him to compare the effort expended with the financial reward. We will see, however, that Brown's conception of art-work goes beyond the simple quantification of creative chores.

From an early stage in his career Brown took an active part in the marketing of his own work. Like most of his generation he was dissatisfied with the role of the Academy but was also wary of the new cultural entrepreneurs such as Ernest Gambart, a leading figure among the new generation of art dealers. Brown was active in exploring alternative exhibitions like the British Institution and the private show.⁴⁹ Each experiment was viewed in terms of a pragmatic estimation of its professional rewards in terms of profit and promise of future profit. The diary documents one artist's involvement with the emerging professional ideal in his listing of the empirical data of his daily work. Yet, as a middle-class man, Brown clings to the status of 'gentleman' to the extent of

ensuring that his fiancée, Emma Hill, the poorly educated daughter of a farmer, received a middle-class education at a 'ladies' seminary' before he married her. The time and expense for this enterprise could be ill-afforded as Brown was not only poor but the couple also had a child.⁵⁰ While we cannot doubt that Brown had a clear and precise understanding of his own place within the class system we need not suppose that this understanding had a simple and understandable structure. Brown was clinging to a gentlemanly status established by the Royal Academy while applying a mixture of commercialism and idealism in the practice of his art. However, it is in Brown's painting that his most cherished conceptions might be thought to emerge. In the next section I will examine the ways in which Work acts as a critique of entrepreneurial society, and also indicates the dilemma of the artist within it.

V

Where can we place Brown's perception of work and class identity in a social situation that was so evidently transitional? The middle of the nineteenth century saw, according to Harold Perkin, the development of conflicting social ideals, each vying for hegemony.⁵¹ The two that relate most closely to Brown's conception of work were the successful entrepreneurial ideal (with which early ideas of professionalism were closely identified) and the emerging and ultimately dominant professional ideal. The emergence of the new professional ideal can be identified in Brown's criticism of the entrepreneur in Work. The differences between these two ideals—the entrepreneurial ideal and the new professional ideal—and that of 'old society' reworked to produce a 'new' aristocratic ideal, are not so much evident in their aim, which ultimately, and most simply, can be described as a stable society, but more in the way the upper classes can achieve

that stability. Neither the market nor 'noblesse oblige' alone can guarantee the social fairness that the professional class increasingly identifies as necessary and sufficient to establish an acceptable modern society. But throughout the nineteenth century all three ideals (the entrepreneurial, the new professional ideal, and the new aristocratic ideal) can be identified in certain beliefs and practices in, and around, art and work. These multiple ideals, all attractive to the mid-Victorian male, placed Brown's Work in an ideologically unstable context. Brown himself can be identified as responding to all three ideals during his life and in this one painting. The belief that appropriate work—that is, work suited to the needs and abilities of the worker—was a necessity for the proper growth of the modern individual, no matter what his means and class, is central to the painting.

This attitude to work had been expounded by Thomas Carlyle and was later applied to art by Ruskin. In Past and Present (1843), Carlyle wrote:

there is a perennial nobleness, and even sacredness, in Work. Were he never so benighted, forgetful of his high calling, there is always hope in a man that actually and earnestly works: in Idleness alone is there perpetual despair.⁵²

Brown's commentary on his painting demonstrates a wish to place the meaning of the work firmly within the terms of Carlyle's discussion which places a high value on mere active labour. Ruskin, on the other hand, is much more concerned with the suitability of that labour to the individual. Both writers deplore excessive toil, preferring work to be lengthy rather than hard. Yet Ruskin deplores the waste of the 'Leonardo da Vincis employed at this moment in . . . harbours and railroads'.⁵³ How appropriate the work of any individual might be to that

individual's particular talents is not a question that is addressed in Brown's painting or in the notes that accompanied it. Brown's aim in writing his commentary on the painting may be intended to set a limit on a disturbing discourse around the suitability of work and the worker. In which case Brown's commentary is evidence of the will to power, a wish to control what might be spoken and to delineate what it is that the painting might speak. Central to an understanding of an ideological function of this and other Pre-Raphaelite paintings is the necessity of establishing a relationship between the actual production and the social events that fuelled that production. Is an interpretation of Work in fact confined to what were by then the well established parameters of Carlyle's virtuous labour? Or does the painting stray into a debate on art and professionalism that Brown does not consciously approve? We must begin by looking at Brown's Work in detail.

Work was intended to be an intensely symbolic narrative on the nature of labour and its moral supremacy over idleness. We should bear in mind that the professional ideal makes distinctions that go further than those between work and idleness. Professionalism resides within discussions on the individual's suitability for the labour he does, whether that labour is proper for his talents and of benefit to his fellow man, and whether it is sincerely done. Professionalism is also very much about being a man—a middle-class man—and dealing with men.

In Work, the figures, both rich and poor, are categorised not only according to their relationship to labour, but also according to class and gender. Brown's interpretation of the painting identifies a variety of workers and non-workers. The androgynous flowerseller on the left was never taught to work and only through his gentleness avoids a life of crime. Had he been taught, he, too,

like the heroic navy, could have been worthy of the respect of all (Plate 2). For Brown chooses the navy as his central illustration of labour. The various other forms of labour (like 'Brainwork'), or non-labour (like begging), relate to the activity of the navy (Plates 3 & 4). The sweat and the hard bodies of the labourers defines the essential nature of work – but not its whole extent. What is it that the navvies are doing? Certainly they are labouring in an heroic way but there is no iconographic clue to point us to the purpose of that work. As such their toil represents the understanding of most of the middle class when presented with an excavation – namely, interest without understanding. Nevertheless there is no doubt that digging holes in a hard earth is indeed work. Whenever we see a man excavating in the heat of the sun we understand ourselves to be in the proximity of elemental labour, whatever its purpose, and we may suppose a similar understanding from the Victorian middle class. By elemental, I mean that Carlyle would have seen in this determined activity recognisable good. Physical labour is a visible opposite of idleness, and the vigour with which that labour is pursued through the heat of the day proclaims its necessity. We are not offered any precise information with which to qualify or quantify the navvies' work. The navvies were not, as Brown tells us, working on 'excavations connected with the supply of water'. They were more probably working on the new sewerage system.⁵⁴ The work was certainly associated with the general movement of social improvements connected with the rise of the industrial class. Such improvements, of course, were evidence of the success of the emerging professional middle class, with their science and statistics, in identifying the essential work that needed to be done to improve life in a modern town. But Brown was not concerned enough to discover the exact nature of the

work and leaves such knowledge to the navy and the invisible professionals who deploy his labour.

Beside the navvies the two 'sages' stand in amused discussion. Brown assures us that it is the 'brainworkers' who order the beneficial direction of all labour. There is a link here, in Brown's commentary, to the ideal of the professional. Secure in their knowledge and skills, the appropriately qualified professional is able to determine where best to apply labour for the benefit of society. Yet the artist does not choose to represent the Clerk of Works or the Civil Engineer, the appropriate brainworkers. Rather, he displays the ideal of middle-class intellectual activity, those heroic navvies of the mind, Carlyle and F. D. Maurice, whose intellectual strength is as apparent as the muscles of the navy. Although these two intellectual figures might applaud constructive work, they are far from directing it. Rather, they are the intellectuals of the emerging professional class, whose ideal of work lurks beneath the surface of Brown's gloss on this painting. In this respect, Brown was interpreting ideas that had begun with Adam Smith and David Ricardo on political economy, but which were being transformed by new professional intellectuals: the very men who represent 'brainwork' in this painting. But what does Work have to say on other fractions of the middle class?

If we consider how the middle class is represented in this painting, and if we discount the intellectuals, the picture is far from flattering. Perkin contends that middle-class hegemony began with the success of the entrepreneurial ideal.⁵⁵ The ability of the commercial and industrial middle classes to create wealth on an hitherto inconceivable scale seemed, for a time, to give their ideals of a free market and competition the appearance of moral virtues. Capital, and the

professional intellectuals who supported it, initially agreed on the fundamental wisdom of competition and the free market. The professional intellectuals believed that enlightened self-interest would attain the greatest good for the largest number, sometimes called the 'greatest happiness principle', a Benthamite and Utilitarian ideal. But as we move further into the period of Capital's dominance the supposed automatic benefits of self-interest fail to materialise. What had appeared to be a shared aim to achieve the greatest good can be identified as two middle-class ideals, the entrepreneurial and the professional. As the professional ideal begins to gain in moral ascendancy then its relationship to the entrepreneurial ideal is transformed from one of support to one of criticism. That is to say that the functional purpose of the professional debate was that of a metalanguage on the discourse of the entrepreneurial ideal. This was necessary because the oppositional ideal, the aristocratic, had lost both economic and moral credibility in the face of the entrepreneurial advance. Only as a reconstituted element in the emerging professional ideal could the 'gentleman' voice his opposition to mammon, and that element to be reclaimed from a medieval and chivalric past, safely sanitised by its distance from the excesses of the Georgian aristocracy. So it is in the spirit of a middle-class morality informed by science and refined by the fastidious honour of the knight errant that the professional views the entrepreneur.

If we examine Brown's painting in the light of such observations, we are prompted to ask exactly who is it that represents the entrepreneurial ideal? To begin with, it is not the rich man at the rear, since he rides a horse like a member of the landed gentry, and this is what he is. Brown writes: 'This gentleman is evidently very rich, probably a Colonel in the army, with a seat in Parliament,

and fifteen thousand a year, and a pack of hounds.' While not inactive, the gentleman's activity certainly does not constitute work. The 'honest true hearted gentleman' needs the guidance of the 'two sages in the corner'. Brown does not doubt but that the wealthy man's innate goodness would be won over by the wise words of Carlyle and Maurice, but he does not hear them. The rich man is separated from the road on which the sages were walking, and it is the labourers and the results of their labours that keeps them apart: 'the road is blocked, and the daughter says we must go back, papa, round the other way'.⁵⁶ The nearest representative of the entrepreneurial spirit in the foreground of the painting would appear to reside in the figure of the beer-seller (Plate 3). While, according to Brown, the beer-seller is to be admired for his plucky rise from the inadequacies of his class and intellectual equipment, the struggle has left its mark upon him. The beer-seller's physical deformity can be read as the effect on the spirit of the economic struggle for wealth even though he is only on the lowest rung of the entrepreneurial ladder. While his courage and determination may be admirable he must always be a figure of pity to the cultured middle class. Decked out in the best finery that Birmingham can produce the beer-seller is a monument to the damage that too much money in hands directed by too little intellectual discrimination can do. The source of proper direction must be the intellectual professional.

Yet who was it who constituted the proper intellectual professional in the production of art-work? There can be little doubt that Ruskin considered himself both qualified and able to fill the role of Clerk of Art-Works. The rise of a ruling class that had little experience of art and few of the attributes of the true cognoscente offered opportunities for those who could make good these

deficiencies. The professional roles that developed were those of producer, educator and interpreter/critic. But while the picture-buying industrialist might have welcomed the qualifications and experience of the critic in guiding his purchase, the painter was perhaps more ambivalent. It had been common practice for many years for journalistic critics to be working artists. Such men, confusingly described as 'professional' critics by W. M. Rossetti because they belonged to the profession they criticised, included active academicians like Frank Stone and W. P. Frith. While many artists felt themselves to be very competent critics such a dual role was to become increasingly uneasy. A contributing factor to this unease was the practice of publishing criticism anonymously which tended to encourage the dubious practice of self-criticism. Ruskin, in his Academy Notes of 1855 promoted the idea of the signed review to improve the integrity of criticism. Younger critics like W. M. Rossetti and F. T. Palgrave, neither of whom were artists, accepted the importance of the signed review and also discussed the merits of the non-artist critic. W. M. Rossetti suspected that the 'only criticism in the long run' that was of any real use was that of the practising artist.⁵⁷ But Rossetti's approval of such artist-critics was qualified by an important proviso — that they be of 'comparable general powers of mind' to the non-artist. As his example of a 'useful and effective' non-artist critic was Ruskin, such a proviso considerably reduced those artists who would qualify. The central thrust of the argument centred, however, on the necessity that the critic be qualified to criticise. To be a professional artist or a professional writer was not sufficient qualification. The artist must have the ability and education to communicate well, and the writer must have a great knowledge of, and passion for, art. A knowledge of art and an ability to communicate an understanding of art to the educated

public – these were the specialised skills of the art critic. In any event, the dual role of artist and critic waned as professionalism waxed. This may have been partly due to the increased use of the signed review from the 1860s, which would have exposed the artist/critic to the anger of rivals, but was probably equally influenced by the increasing imperative to specialise that was the signature of professionalism.

While two painters like Rossetti and Brown might happily recommend each other to new patrons, increasingly the formal status of journal critic rested less comfortably on the shoulders of the practising artist. In the past an artist whose criticisms were tainted with self-interest had competed with the journalist who was handicapped by technical ignorance. Ruskin provided the ideal for the new critic. He was highly educated and knowledgeable in the arts and had an intimate understanding of the work and life of the artist without direct financial involvement in it. In short, his opinions could be honestly held and sincerely given because it was in the proper use of his special knowledge, transcending commercial interests, that Ruskin's professional value resided. But while a painter like Brown might allow Ruskin his right to criticism, the right to direct the artist's proper course was less freely given. Brown's independence led him clearly to state his own intentions and interpretations. But what was the professional critic to make of Brown's detailed self-interpretation?

VI

The lengths to which Brown went to ensure that his audience did not lack the necessary direction to understand his work were extraordinary. Brown's anxiety to fix his own interpretation on Work is perhaps symptomatic of a desire to retain control of the meaning he intended to produce. Critics, and Ruskin especially,

were inclined to develop their own readings of paintings where none had been provided. In the case of both The Awakening Conscience (1852) and The Hireling Shepherd (1851), Holman Hunt was left with little choice but to accept the very detailed reading that Ruskin made as other critics seemed to find them unintelligible. However, the critics who reviewed Brown's exhibition did not deny him the right to produce his own interpretative catalogue. Certainly W. M. Rossetti noted and appreciated it. In a lengthy review in Fraser's Magazine, W. M. Rossetti evaluated the professional importance of Brown's commentary to the critic and art historian.⁵⁸ W. M. Rossetti seems to have accepted the right of the painter to limit the extent of what can be read from his work, and he wishes that such a practice had been followed by all great artists. The anonymous critics in other journals were not so open in their notice of Brown's catalogue. The Art-Journal's critic avoids anything more than a mention of Work, saying he would need a whole chapter to do it justice. We may assume that the extent of the catalogue entry for the painting caused the writer to avoid providing a brief notice of Work, feeling it safer, perhaps, to give none at all. The Athenaeum's reviewer (probably F. G. Stephens), on the other hand, provides a fulsome discussion of Work. Although he does not acknowledge Brown's catalogue, it is clear from the text of the review that he has made free use of it.

There was little later attempt by critics to move beyond the meanings provided by the artist for what is depicted in the painting. The 1984 catalogue of the Tate Gallery exhibition begins its discussion by stating that the painting presents 'work in all its forms', while Julian Treuherz maintains that Work is 'a symbolic tract, celebrating those facets of society founded on honest toil, and demonstrating the ill effects of lack of work, whether from unfortunate poverty or

from riches'.⁵⁹ Work is viewed as an unambiguous representation on the theme of moral political economy. Brown's interpretation of that theme clearly reflected the views of professional intellectuals like Carlyle and F. D. Maurice. But what relationship did it bear to art and conflicting social ideals?

The professional ideal broke with that of the industrial and commercial middle class on the question of government. The early professionals like James Mill who were instrumental in formulating the entrepreneurial ideal agreed that less government was better government. Mill, the father of J. S. Mill, was a follower of Bentham and a proponent of Utilitarianism. James Mill was one of the intellectuals who had helped to form the entrepreneurial ideal, while his son J. S. Mill, although brought up and educated to follow Utilitarian philosophy, in time came to modify his thinking in a way that was much more in line with the professional ideal. The intellectual practices that James Mill had promoted, the modern professional's methods of collecting information, their statistics and their enquiries, convinced J. S. Mill and others of the need for positive action to cure society's ills. The professional intellectuals began to believe that more rather than less government was desirable. In 1857, in a lecture at the Manchester Art Treasures exhibition, Ruskin declared it to be his belief:

That the masses have a right to claim education from their government
 . . . to claim employment from their governours; but only so far as they
 yield to the governour the direction and discipline of their labour; . .
 they have a right to ask that none of their distresses should be
 unrelieved, none of their weaknesses unwatched . . . or the father's
 shield uplifted.⁶⁰

It was clear that Ruskin was among those who favoured more government rather than less. What is also clear is that the relationship of governors and governed is increasingly viewed as a moral question. In Ruskin's exposition the journey from political economy to the production of good art is an inevitable one. Ruskin, not unlike Perkin, believed that artistic genius was a natural resource that must be sought and professionally nurtured. His plans for art foresee a comprehensive system of art education and the role of professionals to nurture young talent. Without a way to identify and nurture talent Ruskin sees gifted artists doomed to toil undiscovered in inappropriate occupations. Importantly, the young artists themselves are to receive a gentlemanly education so as to prepare them to join with their fellow professionals in aesthetic service to society.

Ruskin's influence on the professional developments in Victorian painting were as wide as was his involvement. By the 1860s Ruskin seems to have moved from the idea of the sublime which colours his commentaries on Turner, to the idea that art should be valued for the work involved in producing it. On the one hand his earlier position could inspire Hunt to write on reading Modern Painters:

Up to that day I had been compelled to think that the sober modern world tolerated art only as a sort of vagabondish cleverness, that in England it was a disgrace, charitably modified in very exceptional cases, to have a professional passion for it, and that if toleration of it lingered at all, it would not be in intellectual and elevated circles.⁶¹

On the other hand, Ruskin's later position led him into the notorious attack on Whistler that resulted, during November 1878, in Ruskin being found guilty of a libel and Whistler being awarded a farthing damages. When Ruskin accused Whistler of throwing a pot of paint in the face of the public when he exhibited

Nocturne in Black and Gold, an impressionistic representation of fireworks in Cremorne Gardens, it was to defend a system of values built up around the amount and quality of work that went into the production of painting.⁶² While both aspects of Ruskin's valuation of art as a productive practice are surely linked to the development of a professional ideal it is the identification of the gifted artist with his work which proves of most value to that ideal.

It is this point that brings us back to Ford Madox Brown and Work. Although clearly linked to the theories of Carlyle and Maurice on the benefits of work, the painting bears an important relationship to Ruskin's ideas on the professionalization of artists. Begun some five years before Ruskin's speech, Work was finally exhibited eight years after it. This lengthy labour cannot help but have associated the painting in the artist's mind with the arduous work of the painter himself. Let us consider the 'effeminate' beggar once more, as he passes by the Herculean labourers as if afraid to contemplate their heroic tasks (Plate 2). Carlyle and Maurice demonstrate no shyness in contemplating the labourers. Nor, of course, does Brown in recording it. All three are comfortable in the presence of work because they have practised it and understood its nature. But the beggar, who slips out of the city each morning to pick the beauties of nature to arrange on his tray, does not impose enough of his muscle or mind on the task to qualify as a worker. Yet the beggar may represent some sort of purposeful activity, although stunted. His gentle enjoyment of nature, his considerable, if limited, pursuit of beauty: are these sensibilities not weak parodies of the artist's genius? This artistic soul lacks the knowledge of work. He has, after all, not been 'taught' to work.

Perhaps, in spite of Brown's commentary, we might be allowed to speculate on the iconographic nature of the beggar. If Work itself may stand for creative artistic activity in Brown's catalogue of labour, then could not the beggar represent the artist as he would be without the rigours of professional training and Brown's own 'manly' and prodigious labour? The flower-selling beggar might be that resource of natural talent that Ruskin identified as wasted in our society. While Brown would perhaps agree with Ruskin that artistic talent is a natural occurrence, he portrays it as an essentially unmanly characteristic. Could it be that the beggar's effeminacy suggests that Brown believes that the essential concerns of the artist, beauty and nature, are feminine?⁶³ We know from Battersby that the nature of the artist's genius was often considered by the Romantics to be feminine (although not effeminate). But by 1869 the work of artists and poets associated with Pre-Raphaelitism, and later Aestheticism, were increasingly being criticised in terms of a perceived norm of middle-class masculine sexuality. Alfred Austin, who followed Tennyson as Poet Laureate, identified Pre-Raphaelite production as essentially effeminate. He believed the tendency had begun with Tennyson who was too fond of feminine themes and the female point of view. Austin believed that such feminine themes emasculated men with '[t]he heroines . . . more animal and impassioned than the heroes'.⁶⁴ Austin's criticism is an early manifestation of attitudes that identified the female subject and explicit sexual imagery as the source of Pre-Raphaelite inspiration. In time such criticism was modified to include the homosexual and homoerotic in Aesthetic art, a critique that was confirmed, in the minds of detractors, by the prosecution of Oscar Wilde in 1895 for committing acts of 'gross indecency'.

While Brown was considered one of the most 'manly' of the artists associated with Pre-Raphaelitism and less associated with feminine themes than, for instance, Rossetti, he could hardly fail to be aware of such themes or of middle-class attitudes to artists. The love of nature and beauty, for their own sake, are debilitating and emasculating. The beggar returns 'exhausted . . . to his den', yet has added nothing by his labour to the basket of flowers he has collected. Brown describes the beggar's 'restless gleaming eyes', telling us that he 'doubts and despairs of every one'. It is through work that Brown believes the spirit of the artist can achieve the status of the 'brainworkers' and a manly middle-class identity, as, in the painting, the eye has to pass through the endeavours of the navvies as it moves from the beggar to the intellectuals. And one who travels this way had best take care not to be trapped, like the beer-seller, by the love of wealth and meaningless decoration (Plate 3). The Birmingham finery that the beer-seller wears is characteristic of the cheap and disposable art of which Ruskin writes. The would-be artist, to achieve his rightful stature, must avoid the pitfalls offered by industrial methods and easy profit. The artist, then, cannot follow the ideals of the entrepreneur and must seek an alternative and acceptable system of values. Such a system was emerging with the professional ideal.

VII

When Brown painted Work the rift between the entrepreneurial and professional fractions of the middle class was already becoming noticeable. It is possible that in the painting Brown makes the rift visible. The wealthy horseman, who does not work for his money, may be worthy – but he is none the less separated from the active modern world because he does not work. If visibly good-hearted, this

figure still lacks the benefit of moral direction from the middle-class brainworkers, Carlyle and Maurice. Yet the beer-seller is little better off. Although his money has been gained by his own labour and his perceptive recognition of the wants of his fellow man the beer-seller is improved only materially by his relative wealth. Brown, however, is most critical of the wealth of the entrepreneur. The whole social structure that is supported by the entrepreneurial ideal is questioned, if not fiercely satirised! In the painting, while the beer-seller occupies the lowest rung of the entrepreneurial ladder, the true entrepreneur is represented by Bobus, a character in Carlyle's Past and Present (1843) who is characterised as having made a large fortune from selling horsemeat sausages. The function of Bobus Higgins in Carlyle's chapter on the 'Aristocracy of Talent' is to represent the middle-class entrepreneur who vows that he believes in the promotion of talent. Carlyle asks him if he would vote for, or even recognise talent, if it appeared in a ragged coat.⁶⁵ Brown has the now wealthy Bobus turning to politics. Carlyle's use of the word 'vote' to signify affirmative action in promoting unrecognised talent, is repeated ironically on the boards that 'promote' Bobus's election (Plate 4). Again, in the context of the painting, we must consider which talents in 'ragged coat' might Brown be referring to. The methods Bobus uses for the election are those that brought him success in the sausage trade. Brown illustrates the sausage-maker's use of advertisement but we may assume that other entrepreneurial practices are not far behind. Bobus has made his money by supplying horseflesh as a 'cheap article of human food'. Cheap because the horse, at least in Britain, is not raised for food. Horsemeat comes from the bodies of animals who have spent their life in honest toil. Bobus's values are those of the competitive marketplace. He makes money from supplying an

inferior product cheaply and he seems determined to approach politics in the same spirit.

It is these values that the professional ideal seeks to control and criticise. The values of the entrepreneur are the values that Ruskin assures us, in the Political Economy of Art, will not produce good art. The founding enthusiasm of the PRB to do just that, 'produce thoroughly good pictures', suggests, then, that we will find them opposed to the entrepreneurial spirit of the 1840s. But Pre-Raphaelite art, like Brown's Work, was bought by men who were very much a part of the entrepreneurial society. However, this does not signify that Pre-Raphaelitism was accepted by the whole of entrepreneurial society. Rather such purchases were made by individuals who, while often businessmen, shared some of the social concerns of the Pre-Raphaelites.

The original painting of Work was intended for Thomas Plint of Leeds, who died before its completion. A copy was provided for James Leathart of Newcastle. Both men were from Northern industrial cities; we might suppose them richly endowed with the entrepreneurial spirit. Leathart was an industrialist. Born in 1820, he had become by 1891, managing director of a lead works and a director of the Tyne Steam Shipping Company. He was not, however, an entirely self-made man. Although he had worked his way up, by professional competence, in the firm which he managed, his background was firmly middle-class. His father was a mining engineer, one of the new and progressive professions. Plint, on the other hand, was a stockbroker and while much of his professional life must have revolved, as a man of business, around the Yorkshire mills he was far from the stereotype of the self-made millionaire. Both men are clearly active in the greatly expanding entrepreneurial economy but

have interests outside it. Their devotion and support of Pre-Raphaelite art was not characteristic of their class, but of their individual interests. The 'talents' of the Pre-Raphaelites were promoted and paid for by a relatively small group of Victorian art collectors who took a personal interest in the professional development of these avant-garde artists.

Leathart was still progressing up the managerial ladder in the 1850s when he sought the advice of William Bell Scott, a poet and painter with close associations to Pre-Raphaelitism. Bell Scott had accepted a mastership to the Board of Trade's Government School of Design at Newcastle in 1845 following an unsuccessful attempt to establish himself in London.⁶⁶ Leathart's investment was careful but his interests clearly lay with modern art and in enriching the cultural life of middle-class Newcastle. Plint, on the other hand, seems to have had great interest in the social and religious improvement of the poor. In a letter to Brown on the subject of Work, Plint, who had commissioned the painting for 400 guineas, asked if Brown could 'change one of the four fashionable young ladies into a quiet, earnest, holy-looking one, with a book or two and tracts?'⁶⁷ In the final version of Work such a woman is passing a tract to a hod carrier rising from a hole behind the heroic navvy (Plate 2). This was not the only change that Plint required. He was of an evangelical turn of mind and felt that Brown's conception neglected the religious and moral element of work. Brown's early sketches, interestingly, have a single figure on the right which the Tate catalogue identifies as an artist (Plate 5).⁶⁸ Brown replaced that lone figure with Carlyle and Maurice (although Plint seems to have favoured Charles Kingsley, that very muscular Christian, over Maurice) in an attempt to meet Plint's requirements.

The nature of the changes that Plint required demonstrate the influence that the consumer could exercise over the artist's original intention. It would appear that Brown's original design for the painting emphasised the artist's role as brainworker and professional in a more positive and central way. Although the person of the artist lost his prominent place in Work he remains, of course, in the fabric of the painting. Brown's original intentions as to the inclusion of an artist also lend some weight to my speculations on the nature of the effeminate beggar's place in the painting. But while such evidence points to Brown's involvement in the intellectual and professional status of the artist, the modifications that he made speak even more loudly of the influence on artist and patron of the demands of the emerging professional ideal. It was in the social and cultural aspects of Pre-Raphaelite painting that Plint and Leathart were interested. They did not seek paintings that reinforced the efficacy of the entrepreneurial ideal but encouraged art that was essentially critical of the effects of uncontrolled capitalism. It was an awareness among certain of the commercial middle-classes, as well as the intellectuals, of the dangers of unbridled self-interest, that provided a living for critical artists and writers. As Adam Smith and James Mill had enjoyed the patronage of Whig landowners while developing the entrepreneurial ideology, so the social consciences of certain entrepreneurs led them to patronise Pre-Raphaelite painters. Initially, the middle class seemed combined in one economic and socially progressive movement but between the 1850s and the 1880s certain fractions of the middle class became disillusioned with the ability of capital alone to improve society.

Notes to Chapter One

- ¹ Harold Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society (London: Routledge, 1969), 257.
- ² Jane Austen, 1811, Letters (1884) ref. 11. 86. in Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd Edition on compact disc for IBM PC (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- ³ F. M. Maurice, Lecture on the Education of the Middle Classes, (1839) ref. 186. in Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd Edition on compact disc for IBM PC (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- ⁴ Frank Mort, Dangerous Sexualities: medico-moral politics in England from 1830 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), 51.
- ⁵ See T. W. Heyck, Intellectual Life in Victorian England (London: Croom Helm, 1982), 155–187.
- ⁶ Harold Perkin, The Rise of Professional Society: England Since 1880 (London: Routledge, 1989), 7.
- ⁷ Raymond Williams, Keywords [1976] (London: Fontana Paperbacks Flamingo edition, 1983), 143.
- ⁸ Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society, 256.
- ⁹ Christine Battersby, Gender and Genius: Towards a Feminist Aesthetics [1989] (London: The Women's Press, 1994), 10.
- ¹⁰ Perkin, Professional Society, 6.
- ¹¹ Christopher Hill, The Collected Essays vol. 3 (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1986) 233.
- ¹² Michel Foucault, The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Translated from the French by Robert Hurley (London: Peregrine, 1984), 43.

¹³ Hill, Collected Essays 3 (1986), 233.

¹⁴ Perkin, Professional Society, 7.

¹⁵ Ibid., 117.

¹⁶ Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society, 258.

¹⁷ Robert Gray, 'Bourgeois Hegemony in Victorian Britain', in Sally Hibbin ed.

The Communist University of London: Politics, Ideology and the State (London:

Lawrence and Wishart, 1978), 75.

¹⁸ William Holman Hunt's father was a warehouse manager, while F. G.

Stephens's parents were master and mistress of a workhouse. Millais's was an old

Jersey family of private means, but these were exhausted in bringing the young

artist to London and establishing him in his career. The social origins of Rossetti

while more exotic, his father being an Italian political refugee, were similarly

precarious, Rossetti senior earning a limited income as a professor of Italian at the

King's College, London. James Collinson's father was a stationer, bookseller and

sub-postmaster in Nottinghamshire. Nor were the Pre-Raphaelites who were not

of the Brotherhood from more wealthy stock, with the notable exception of

William Morris. Born in Calais, Ford Madox Brown was the son of a half-pay

ships purser, and John Brett the son of an Army vet. Edward Burne-Jones's father

was a gilder and frame maker, while Thomas Seddon was the son of a cabinet

maker.

¹⁹ David Lodge, The Modes of Modern Writing (London: Edward Arnold, 1977),

38.

²⁰ Stefan Collini, Public Moralists (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 60-90.

²¹ John Stuart Mill, 'Inaugural Address Delivered to the University of St Andrew's' (1867) in Collini, Public Moralists (1991), 71-2.

²² Viewing art as an ideal way to communicate moral values was by no means novel. There was a well developed tradition by the time William Hogarth developed a peculiarly British style of pictorial morality in the eighteenth century.

²³ Robert Gray, 'Bourgeois Hegemony', 76.

²⁴ William Michael Rossetti, Dante Gabriel Rossetti as Designer and Writer (London: 1889), ix-x.

²⁵ John Tosh, 'Domesticity and Manliness in the Victorian Middle Class', in Manful Assertions, Masculinities in Britain since 1800, eds., Michael Roper and John Tosh (London: Routledge, 1991), 44 and 49.

²⁶ Mort, Dangerous Sexualities (1987), 51.

²⁷ Giles Walkley, Artists' Houses in London 1764-1914 (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1994), 1.

²⁸ Ibid., 1.

²⁹ Ibid., 37-8.

³⁰ William Gaunt, The Pre-Raphaelite Dream (originally published as The Pre-Raphaelite Tragedy [1942] and retitled for this edition) (London: The Reprint Society, 1943), 22.

³¹ Roger Fry, Vision and Design [1920] (London: Pelican Books, 1961), 53.

³² Stephen Spender, 'The Pre-Raphaelite Literary Painters', in Pre-Raphaelitism, edited by James Sambrook (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974), 118.

³³ Stephen F. Eisenman, ed. Nineteenth Century Art: a Critical History (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994), 207.

³⁴ Timothy Hilton, The Pre-Raphaelites [1970] (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991), 7.

³⁵ Allen Staley, 'Exhibition Reviews', Burlington Magazine 126 (June 1984), 369–71.

³⁶ John Guille Millais, The Life and Letters of John Everett Millais, PRA., 2 vols. (London: Methuen, 1899), 1:55.

³⁷ Deborah Cherry and Griselda Pollock, 'Patriarchal Power and the Pre-Raphaelites', Art History 7 (1984), 481.

³⁸ Lynne Pearce, Woman/Image/Text (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), 3.

³⁹ Marcia Pointon, Pre-Raphaelites re-viewed, ed. Marcia Pointon (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), vii.

⁴⁰ See Sidney C. Hutchison, The History of the Royal Academy 1768-1968 (London: Chapman Hall, 1968), 93–112.

⁴¹ Hilton, Pre-Raphaelites, 158.

⁴² John Ruskin, 'The Political Economy of Art', in Unto this Last (Everyman Edition, London: J. M. Dent, n. d.), 25.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁴⁴ Hilton, Pre-Raphaelites, 158-59.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 158-59. While Morris's point of view would seem to imply a devaluation of the intellect in artistic work, as against say, Reynolds's efforts to elevate the intellectual status of artists, we must remember the idealist socialism that Morris preached. I do not think Morris denied the intellect so much as questioned that it should be valued more highly.

⁴⁶ Smiles is cited in Herbert Sussman, Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 118.

⁴⁷ Herbert Sussman, Victorian Masculinities (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 118.

⁴⁸ Ford Madox Brown, The Diary of Ford Madox Brown, ed. Virginia Surtees (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 91.

⁴⁹ The British Institution held an annual 'free' exhibition, where, for a fee of £5 an artist could exhibit his work without having it selected by a jury, as it was at the Royal Academy. The 'Free' was of course a public exhibition and as such work first hung there was automatically precluded from exhibition later at the RA.

⁵⁰ Virginia Surtees, in The Diary of Ford Madox Brown, xiii-xiv.

⁵¹ Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society, 271 – 339.

⁵² Thomas Carlyle, 'Past and Present' (1843), in Sartor Resartus, Heroes and Hero-Worship, Past and Present (London: Ward, Lock, n.d.), 135-6.

⁵³ Ruskin, 'Political Economy of Art', 14

⁵⁴ Julian Treuherz, Pre-Raphaelite Paintings from the Manchester City Art Gallery (London: Lund Humphries, 1980), 54, and The Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites (London: Penguin Books, 1984), 163.

⁵⁵ Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society, 271.

⁵⁶ Ford Madox Brown in Pre-Raphaelite Paintings from the Manchester Art Gallery, 57-8.

⁵⁷ William Michael Rossetti, 'Mr. Palgrave and Unprofessional Criticisms of Art' in Fine Art [1867] (New York: AMS Press, 1970), 326.

⁵⁸ William Michael Rossetti, 'Mr Madox Brown's Exhibition, and its Place in our School of Painting', Fraser's Magazine 71 (May 1865), 598-607.

⁵⁹ Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites, 163 and Julian Treuherz, Pre-Raphaelite Paintings from the Manchester City Art Gallery, 53.

⁶⁰ Ruskin, 'Political Economy of Art', 11.

⁶¹ William Holman Hunt, Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood 2 vols (London: Macmillan, 1905), 1: 73.

⁶² Accounts of the trial and the incidents around it can be found in several sources, for example Richard Ellman, Oscar Wilde (London: Penguin, 1988), 76 and 125.

⁶³ It should be noted here that the use of the terms 'effeminate' and 'effeminacy' had a different connotation from that which it acquired at the end of the century. Certainly effeminacy did not refer to behaviour that was overtly homosexual, but rather to an excessive interest in women and women's concerns. See, Alan Sinfield, The Wilde Century: Effeminacy, Oscar Wilde and the Queer Moment (London: Cassell, 1994), 25–51.

⁶⁴ Alfred Austin, 'The Poetry of the Period: Mr Swinburne', Temple Bar, 26 (1869), cited in Elizabeth Helsinger, et al The Woman Question—Literary Issues 3 (New York: Garland, 1983), 160.

⁶⁵ Carlyle, 'Past and Present', 22.

⁶⁶ William Bell Scott, The Autobiographical Notes of William Bell Scott, 2 vols. [1892] (New York: AMS Press, 1970), 1:166-93.

⁶⁷ Treuherz, Pre-Raphaelite Paintings from the Manchester City Art Gallery, 63.

⁶⁸ The Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites, 164-5.

2 Periodicals, Professionalism and the PRB

I

With an understanding of what the professional ideal is and how it might figure within an example of Pre-Raphaelite art we can now move on to consider the ways in which professionalism influenced that art and the debate that surrounded it. The public forum of that debate was the periodical press. The Victorian journal was both an organ promoting and practising professionalism as well as the site where the products of that professionalism were most vociferously attacked by the forces of reaction. Increased specialisation in the periodical press had its effect on art criticism and on the practice of artists. The PRB emerged as an entity just as both the specialist art magazine and the specialist art critic were becoming culturally and economically viable in the periodical market. This chapter will show, first, how the nature of the periodical debate on Pre-Raphaelitism was one that centred on changing professional practices, and, second, that what was a new type of discussion on art and artists had an important influence on the way Pre-Raphaelite artists began to evolve alternative approaches to the practice of their profession. To understand how such radical changes might be possible it is important to realise the scale of the evolutionary laboratory in which so many cultural experiments were taking place.

Between 1824 and 1900 somewhere in the region of 50,000 periodical titles were published in Britain.¹ Needless to say, these periodicals offer us an invaluable insight into Victorian culture; as John S. North says, 'most of the

commonly used sources of information about the age—the fiction, essays, handbooks, analyses and reports—were first published in the periodicals'.² The reading public was larger and wider than it had ever been and included not only most of the lower-middle class, but poorer groups as well. It was through the medium of the periodical that the Victorians communicated and learned of the rapid changes—social, scientific, technological and cultural—that were taking place in their society. Where does the artist figure within this proliferation of mid-nineteenth-century documents pertaining to professionalism? During the 1830s and 1840s a number of professionals outside the tradition of the three learned professions of church, law and physic used the expedient of periodical debate to extend their claims to respectability. Surgeons, architects and civil engineers used both specialised and general periodicals to promote their interests. Artists had similar opportunities. Popular periodicals such as Charles Knight's Penny Magazine (1832–1845) included articles on the fine arts while the Art-Union (1839–1848—later the Art-Journal 1849–1912) was the first magazine devoted to art to survive for more than a handful of years. The established and most powerful periodicals were, up to and beyond the 1840s, devoted to the interests of the Tory aristocracy. Harold Perkin calls the aristocracy the 'army of possession' in the 'battle for the mind'.³ And the Quarterly Review (1809–1962), Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine (1817–1905) and the Times (as the Daily Universal Register from 1 January 1785 until 31 December 1787 and as the Times from 1 January 1788 and still current) were the organs through which the ideals of 'old society' battled for the minds of the educated populace. The Whigs fielded smaller battalions in the form of the Westminster Review (1824-1914) and the Morning Chronicle (1769-1865),⁴ both promoting the Utilitarian ideology of Jeremy Bentham and James

Mill. It was in the context of the wider political and ideological conflict in such periodicals that the Pre-Raphaelites first enjoyed the attention of the public. But the general periodical was not the only organ of social change available. The reader whose interests were more specialised, by occupation or inclination, also had to be catered for. Before moving on to look at how the PRB fared in this periodical climate, I intend to consider the case of how one other professional group, the surgeons, used journalism to promote their specific aims. Surgeons provide an excellent example of an identifiable professional group who fared exceptionally well during the nineteenth century, in their bid to establish themselves as modern, progressive, and scientific practitioners.

II

Although there is little obvious similarity between the occupation of surgeon and that of artist—except, perhaps, for a shared interest in anatomy—the surgeons' approach to their profession serves to provide a model of successful practice in achieving higher status for themselves and their calling. A model that may well have influenced early Pre-Raphaelite activities. Thomas Wakely first published The Lancet in the 1820s with the intention of 'improving' the practice of surgery in the capital. The Lancet is an important example of the specialist journal because surgery was opposed to an outdated practice of medicine.⁵ The surgeons' opposition centred on the status given to physic—a conventional approach to medicine based on classical models—and was articulated in the application of modern science-based empirical observation. In order to spread knowledge and generate debate, the Lancet provided critical reports of operations in London's teaching hospitals. Wakely also attacked the nepotism that was a common feature of the London hospitals. The intervention of one's influential connections was the

expected eighteenth-century way and, as W. J. Reader points out, patronage, especially of family connections, continued well into the nineteenth century.⁶ In the early nineteenth century surgeons were increasingly sensitive to the function of 'old society' as it was only in the mid-eighteenth century that surgeons had parted company with the barbers and surgery still lacked the social cachet of physic. The development of the Lancet as a professional organ was intimately involved in the growing conflict between the patronage of old society and the selection by merit that sought to establish an efficient superstructure to service a new society. In debating the practice of surgery, Wakely was also questioning the status of physic and the way physicians qualified.

To become a licentiate, and later fellow, of the Royal College of Physicians a candidate had to be a graduate of either Oxford or Cambridge. These universities, as Perkin points out, were institutions organised in the interests of established Anglican aristocratic society.⁷ Neither university provided any medical tuition in the early nineteenth century and such medical knowledge had to be gained elsewhere, usually at one of the teaching hospitals in London or at the University of Edinburgh, an early pioneer in medical education. The examination for the licence and the fellowship were anyway brief and cursory, often lasting no more than half an hour and always oral; the liberal arts degree was the main qualification. Surgeons, on the other hand, usually underwent an extensive practical training, often beginning as apprentices to an established surgeon on payment of a premium—in the case of famous surgeons this would be a substantial sum. The education of physicians was that of an eighteenth-century gentleman while that of the surgeon more resembled the practical training of a skilled tradesman.

The social origins of a surgeon were more likely to be humble, from the lower-middle or artisan classes, the same social group from which many artists, including most of the PRB, came. The lower-middle class was growing in size and in aspiration and was largely an urban phenomenon. Eighteenth-century methods of patronage could not provide for ambitious individuals from humble urban families, as the interest of an influential patron was necessarily confined to family or regional connections and only rarely recognised the talents of outsiders. Only by appealing for systems of preferment based on merit could members of the lower-middle class hope to rise to the status of the established professions. In promoting this ideal, Wakely and others were also providing a model for the efficient servicing of a modern economic and political system. Wakely applied pressure by demonstrating the advances made in the practice of surgery and highlighting incompetence when it was the result of nepotism. The aim of the surgeons was to establish a system that emphasised a certain type of performance above background and interest. It was an aim that they shared with many fractions of the middle classes.

The use of the periodical to promote the professionalization of other callings followed that of surgery; although there is no particular reason to suppose that later specialist periodicals were emulating the specific example of the Lancet. But the success of the Lancet, coupled with the increasing tendency to specialise that is such a clear indicator of middle-class professionalization, must have encouraged the emergence of similar occupational journals. One notable example is the Builder. First published in 1842, it aimed to promote discussion and interest in architecture and the building trade. The Builder retained some qualities of the unspecialised Victorian periodical. It carried more articles of

general interest than we would perhaps expect in a similar periodical today.⁸ In a profession whose history was dominated by the ideas of the gifted amateur, the Builder played its part in establishing an academic and scientific foundation for architects. However, while civil engineering was admitted as a profession in the census by 1861, architecture did not achieve that status until 1881. Although architecture was increasingly scientifically based, the social position of architects was problematical. While distinguished practitioners might consider their profession an art many were clearly tradesmen and little more than jobbing builders. Training for architecture was still primarily through apprenticeship and there was little academic training until the end of the century.

An academic training was not the whole answer to the acquisition of professional status for the middle-class male. In the case of the artist, the Royal Academy had established a rigid form of academic study, usually extending over ten years, yet the status of artists depended more on the patronage of eminent families and financial success than on the strict practice of their profession. The art education offered by the Academy was one based on a study of classical models and post-Raphaelite conventions, one might call it the practical equivalent of the liberal arts studied in Oxford and Cambridge. This was a programme firmly founded on Enlightenment models and designed to make History painters of its most able students. But there was little patronage for History painting and no market for it. While History painting enjoyed high status, the traditional large History painting was of little interest to the general run of art buyers. Of much greater interest was a smaller type of painting, what we might call genre-History, a hybrid that attempted to elevate the status of the humble genre painting. Later in the century History painting enjoyed a popular renaissance led by the likes of

Lord Leighton in classical reconstructions and Lady Butler as a chronicler of empire. During the 1830s and 1840s, however, the reputation of English History painting was at a low ebb. The Academy's failure to keep in step with the modern world in the training and leadership it provided was the centre of an on-going debate and compared unfavourably with the success of the surgeons.

While in the censuses of 1841 to 1861 surgeons and physicians were recorded separately, by 1871 they were taken together. Wakely, the Lancet and the surgeons were demonstrably successful in establishing themselves as nineteenth-century professionals. Frank Mort's definition of professional masculinity as hard-edged and scientific – if this is considered in relation to the Pre-Raphaelites as much as to surgeons – offers the possibility of insights into both the Pre-Raphaelite style and their promotion of alternatives to established practices.⁹ Millais, Hunt and, to an extent, Rossetti developed the Pre-Raphaelite style in response to the identification of nature as the principal site which produced scientific truths. By establishing a technique which relied upon the direct observation of nature – and representing that nature in meticulous detail that allowed for no retouching – painting could be allied to scientific experiment. Of course this early purity of intention, almost exclusively limited to the initial productions of Hunt and Millais, soon gave way to the pragmatic demands of available time and the art market.¹⁰ However, even the use of a dry white ground was enough to differentiate Pre-Raphaelite paintings from the mass of early Victorian production. Whether they used wet or dry white grounds the resulting paintings were eye-catching: they were more brightly coloured than most of the neighbouring paintings in a public exhibition. The scientific claim of the wet white technique to be an empirical observation and open to objective tests of

accuracy never became a real issue with either hostile or friendly critics. The result, if not the intention, of meticulous Pre-Raphaelite practice was to encourage competition as paintings and artists became more easily identified as modern or traditional. But for the Pre-Raphaelites to make an impression on the establishment the mid-Victorian critical debate on painting had to move away from a discussion that recognised only how well academic conventions were interpreted to a dialogue that could accommodate critiques of just that practice. A change in the criteria of evaluation of the function and appearance of painting could only be attained if professional pursuits could be openly discussed in contemporary journals.

III

The work that the Brotherhood exhibited in 1849 elicited a response in the periodical press that was luke-warm, but not hostile. The 'primitive' tendency in both subject matter and in the treatment of PRB paintings was noticed almost immediately and was not condemned but rather considered with interest and sympathy. The critic in the Art-Journal wrote of Hunt's Rienzi Vowing to Obtain Justice for the Death of His Young Brother:

We have this year seen more essays in the manner of early Art than we have ever before remarked in the country within so short a period. Of this class is the picture now noticed, and it is perhaps more austere in its denials than any of the others we have observed.

And of Millais's Isabella, the same critic remarked:

This picture is not less worthy of praise than any of those that have preceded it, and these are few, for the author of the work is a young painter, but already rich in reputation. The picture differs in style from

its predecessors, inasmuch as it is a pure aspiration in the feeling of the early Florentine school.¹¹

While the critic in the Art-Journal was sensitive to a certain stylistic similarity in the paintings he pursued that insight no further.

The critic in the Art-Journal did not identify in Pre-Raphaelitism a school that challenged the conventions of Academic painting as enshrined in Reynolds's Discourses, those influential lectures delivered to the Royal Academy schools between 1769 and 1790 and later published in book form. The rejection of the standard classical conventions as expounded in the eighteenth-century academic training of the Academy schools was an integral part of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood's agenda and one of their explicit aims. By avoiding the use of the conventions of classical composition, chiaroscuro and dead-colouring, early Pre-Raphaelite paintings were expected by their authors to stand as clear criticisms of the existing Academic practice. The periodical critics, by their indifference to the reconstructive intention of the paintings, presented the Brotherhood with the problem of how to communicate their opposition to conventional art without making a direct statement of intent. Dangerously public attacks on the Academy were certainly not an aim of the Brotherhood, even if it is now possible to consider this as implicit in their formation. But their resultant secrecy had clearly established a barrier to public understanding. What was needed to establish an informed discussion of Pre-Raphaelite innovations was an extension of their programme and the introduction of material contrived to open an appropriate debate.

The suggestion that the Brotherhood should publish their own magazine is usually credited to Rossetti, largely on the authority of his brother, W. M.

Rossetti. Rossetti's greatest contribution to the PRB in its early days was his enthusiastic formation of novel approaches to developing a new school of painting—approaches that probably owed much to his own literary leanings and imagination. Another considerable benefit that accrued to the PRB through Rossetti's membership was that he brought with him his brother. Once the idea was aired the advantages of such a journal could be appreciated but without the organisational ability of W. M. Rossetti, and his determination to see his talented brother's dreams realised, there can be little doubt that The Germ (January to April 1850) would have remained a pretty idea unquickened by necessary nutriment. So it was through the careful midwifery of W. M. Rossetti that his brother's passing fancy produced a journal. An infant periodical entirely devoted to articles, poems and illustrations sympathetic to Pre-Raphaelitism which would allow the PRB to demonstrate that it was Nature that they copied not mediaeval art, and that their intentions looked to the future not the past. In a magazine it would be possible to argue that they approached nature with an innocent eye, in the spirit of the scientific researcher. Such direct involvement in a debate around Pre-Raphaelite practice was clearly linked to the development of middle-class ideas on the earnest pursuit of a profession. Ideas that were in conflict with those of the aristocratic ideology that left the artist poised between the roles of craftsman and gentleman.

It is in the context of the debate on the role of the Academy and the future of Art that we should view the publication of The Germ. However, The Germ is not the only publication put together by a group of young men. A magazine called The Original was published in 1849 in Liverpool by a 'Few Young Men as an Amusement For Their Leisure Hours'.¹² Although it seems to have enjoyed

only one issue, fewer even than The Germ, it tackled such cultural topics as 'The Use and Abuse of Poetry.' Private and youthful publication of a periodical was not, then, unique to the Brotherhood, for where one can be found we must suppose there were others. But it is more than the youth of the publishers that makes the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood's enterprise interesting and unusual. The Germ was undertaken with serious professional intentions to promote an artistic movement. The efforts of the Brotherhood to generate discussion on their views on what art should be seemed to excite little controversy, the magazine was noticed, it was praised faintly and it remained largely unsold. Although its significance may not have been noted at the time, the influence of The Germ on British avant-garde small magazines is undeniable. In the context of the debate on modern art The Germ apparently had its own distinctive voice. The Germ contained a mixed offering of poetry, art criticism, art theory and imaginative prose all produced by the Brothers or sympathetic friends like Coventry Patmore and Ford Madox Brown. The layout and typeface of the magazine was fashionably gothic and the theme of much of the literary work was medieval or early Italian. The bias of the criticism and theoretical writing stressed nature and naturalness and questioned the blind following of tradition. The following extract from an essay by F. G. Stephens illustrates the magazine's involvement with the modern:

The sciences have become almost exact in the present century. . . And how has this been done but by bringing greater knowledge to bear upon the wider range of experiment; by being precise in the search after the truth? If this adherence to fact, to experiment and not theory, — to begin at the beginning and not fly to the end, — has added

much to the knowledge of man in science; why may it not greatly assist the moral purposes of the Arts?¹³

On the strength of his contributions to this publication W. M. Rossetti was offered space in the Critic to discuss and review art (on an unpaid basis) in a similar vein.¹⁴ In their book on Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Brian and Judy Dobbs see this as a significant event in the periodical attacks that were to follow.

There has been considerable debate on the origins of the extensive critical attacks that the PRB endured in their second year of exhibition. The most popular interpretation of events is that Rossetti's penchant for informing all and sundry of the meaning of the initials provoked a reaction against the term 'brotherhood', with its Roman Catholic connotations. A better documented explanation is offered by Brian and Judy Dobbs who date the antipathy to the Pre-Raphaelites from W. M. Rossetti's first review in the Critic.¹⁵ W. M. Rossetti reviewed the 1850 exhibition at the British Institution and his brother assisted him in writing it. In his journal entry for the 5 February 1850 William Rossetti notes that 'Gabriel assumed the responsibility of F. S. and a few others'.¹⁶ The F. S. mentioned was Frank Stone, a painter with an established reputation, an academician and, significantly, an art reviewer on several journals including the Athenaeum (January 1828-February 1921). Rossetti's review of Stone's Sympathy was written in the spirit of PRB meetings, iconoclastic and disrespectful. Used to denigrating names as revered as Reynolds's in private, Rossetti did not hesitate to spread scorn upon the work of a disciple of the great man in public. Nor could the irony Rossetti utilised be described as subtle:

Whether the sympathy of the gazer with the painter, or of the painter with his subject, or indeed of the young lady in faded yellow with the

young lady in washed-out red, or vice versa, be the sympathy here symbolised, there is no precise clue to determine. . . All that we can know for certain . . . is . . . somewhere, a mild young lady threw her arms . . . round another sorrowful but very mild young lady; that the faces of these young ladies were made of wax, their hair of Berlin wool, and their hands of scented soap.¹⁷

This was strong stuff from a fledgling painter, especially one so sensitive to criticism himself. However, Rossetti did not expect to be identified as the author of this review. It was usual in 1850 to publish criticism anonymously and Rossetti must have felt himself further protected by the fact that his brother was the supposed writer of the review. W. M. Rossetti had also expected this impolitic notice to be published anonymously but reported in a journal entry for 1 March 1850:

The new number of the Critic was sent me by the Editor, containing the end of my review, to which to my surprise and annoyance, I find my initials have been added. This must be taken care of.¹⁸

But the damage had already been done, and the confrontation that the Brothers had wished to avoid was about to begin. The editor of the Critic, perhaps in response to the 'lively' nature of the review, clearly felt that the reviewer should be identifiable.

IV

As was the case in 1849, Rossetti had again in 1850 found himself unable to trust his work to the scrutiny and judgement of the Academy jury. So it followed, that of the Pre-Raphaelite paintings exhibited that season, Rossetti's Ecce Ancilla Domini! was the first to be seen. The painting—again repeating the practice of the

year before—was hung in the Free Exhibition of the British Institution in April: A review duly appeared in the Athenaeum:

Ignoring all that has made the art great in the greatest masters, the school to which Mr Rossetti belongs would begin the work anew, and accompany the faltering steps of its earliest explorers. . . these men, professing to look only to Nature in its truth and simplicity, are the slavish imitators of artistic inefficiency.

This review demonstrates that the ideas that form the basis of Pre-Raphaelitism, and its group identity, have now entered the discussion of their work. Both William and Gabriel Rossetti believed Stone to be the author of the review (PRB Journal, 21 July 1850) and of a subsequent Athenaeum review on Millais's and Hunt's paintings in the Royal Academy exhibition. The view that Stone was a particular enemy of Pre-Raphaelitism is supported by Hunt's use of an engraving of that artist's Cross Purposes in The Awakening Conscience. The print was identified by Hunt in his 1865 pamphlet on The Light of the World and its use was clearly intended, in view of the artist's antipathy to the Brotherhood, as a joke at Stone's expense.¹⁹ How far the Brotherhood's ideas had been spread by The Germ and by discussion with fellow artists we cannot say. Clearly Stone did not find it difficult to identify the aims and identities of the principals. Those elements of the Pre-Raphaelite style that Stone had identified were taken up by critics in both serious publications like the Times and the Athenaeum and in popular journals like Household Words (established in 1850 and continuing until 1859 when it was incorporated in All The Year Round).

In the Illustrated London News, the gossip column entitled 'Town Talk and Table Talk' explained to its readers the meaning of the initials PRB and the strange archaeological ideas that lay behind those three letters:

Sydney Smith said that Quakers would, if they could, have clothed all creation in grey. The 'PRB' would be bolder still, for they would beat it out flat, and make men and women like artfully-shaped and coloured pancakes.²⁰

The attack on Pre-Raphaelitism, then, can be identified as a defence of the established practice of art. Not only is the Pre-Raphaelite style perceived to be in opposition to the academic tradition but a leading member of the group has been seen to attack that tradition in print. The site of the dispute is the very pursuit of the profession of modern art and what is considered to best constitute the true professional.

Quite rapidly, and certainly by the mid-1850s, the nature of the discussion on Pre-Raphaelitism in the periodicals had changed, seeming, at least, to accept that the movement was more than a youthful jape or aberration. As early as 1852 David Masson writing in the British Quarterly Review had written a balanced article that admitted the qualified success of Pre-Raphaelite principles. Masson noted that there had been a 'complete change' in the reception that the Pre-Raphaelites had received. The Times had been 'driven into silence' and the works of the Pre-Raphaelites, especially Millais, had been 'more heartily praised than any others in the [Royal Academy] Exhibition'.²¹ The re-evaluation that Masson suggests was, however, less than complete and indicates the sentimental appeal of Millais's A Huguenot, on St Bartholomew's Day, Refusing to Shield Himself from Danger by Wearing the Roman Catholic Badge—the popular success of the

Royal Academy exhibition that year. It is likely that Masson's view reflects the progressive response to Pre-Raphaelitism rather than any universal acceptance. Certainly Pre-Raphaelitism remained controversial and the target of strongly worded aversion and support in pamphlets, books, and the periodical press. However, it is perhaps significant that a book purporting to review ten centuries of European art published in 1852 should include a section on Pre-Raphaelite art.²² Henry Noel Humphries's book, while clearly reflecting some of the views expressed in Ruskin's pamphlet on Pre-Raphaelitism, offers a balanced and illuminating evaluation of the fledgling movement. He notes the 'partisan' nature of the criticism of the Pre-Raphaelites, one set 'lauding to the skies even the first efforts of these young painters'; while the other sees only what is 'crude, hideous, and contemptible.' Humphries maintains that the press, by throwing its 'ponderous sword' on the opposing side of the scale has, with 'taunt and sneer', acted, like an 'over-dose of some poisons', to serve as its own antidote.²³ A strong section of the public, Humphries believes, have taken the side of the Pre-Raphaelites, and that because of this, 'in a pecuniary sense, their fortunes are made.' Humphries has criticisms of the Pre-Raphaelites, believing that their figure work, and especially the representation of female heads, is lacking in perception. Perhaps what is most impressive about Humphries's analysis of Pre-Raphaelite success is his belief that it is the extremism of the Pre-Raphaelite style and the controversy that this has produced which has led to their growing fame. Indeed, he goes on to write:

I conceive, that a school founded upon an almost opposite principle, producing details by a few broad and telling touches, and upon

general effect produced by means of well studied masses, of form, colour, and light and shade, may be coequally . . . successful.²⁴

It is clear that in certain informed circles an understanding was emerging of the importance of oppositional styles to the production of modern art.

The year of 1856 too is significant in the periodical attention that the Pre-Raphaelites attract. Not only are the Brotherhood evaluated in comparative reviews by at least two journals, Fraser's Magazine and the Eclectic Review, but are also resurrected by Edward Burne-Jones in his review of William Makepeace Thackeray's novel, The Newcomes in the Oxford and Cambridge Magazine. The Newcomes traces the adventures of Clive Newcome, the son of Colonel Newcome, an officer of humble background who has achieved status and wealth in the Indian army. The major theme of the novel is respectability, and whether this can be maintained in an unsuitable profession or a loveless marriage. Clive Newcome wishes to become a professional artist and much of the book is concerned with the nature of that profession and how a gentleman might pursue it. The choice of this novel to review gave Burne-Jones the opportunity to consider his own future as an artist but also to participate in the current debates on Pre-Raphaelitism. The reason for this attention is not at once obvious, while in retrospect 1856 might be viewed as the point of balance when the fulfilment of early promise gave way to the broader development of Pre-Raphaelite production, this would not have been self-evident at the time. The increase in positive interest in Pre-Raphaelitism prompted renewed attacks from opposed critics, notably that of the Reverend Edward Young who found Hunt's Scapegoat irreliously real.²⁵ By 1856 the original membership of the Brotherhood were separated—physically, artistically and spiritually—and effectively bound

together only by the debates on Pre-Raphaelitism. Yet Pre-Raphaelitism as a style was very much alive and it was perhaps the growing influence of that style which prompted such an extensive resurrection of interest.

Of the original Pre-Raphaelites only Millais's work and a single painting by Holman Hunt could be seen by the art-viewing public at that year's Royal Academy exhibition. However, that same public would have marked the significant number of paintings influenced by the PRB, paintings by Hughes, Inchbold, Wallis, Bowler and, of course, Ford Madox Brown's The Last of England at the Liverpool Academy. Brown's particular relationship to Pre-Raphaelitism is complex. His interest in medieval subjects before the emergence of the Pre-Raphaelites and the influence of the Nazarenes on his work clearly suggest the possibility that he influenced the formation of the Brotherhood. Neither should it be forgotten that Rossetti approached Brown before settling on Hunt as a teacher. Yet following the critical interest engendered by the Pre-Raphaelites and the support that Ruskin offered them, Brown seems to have been content with association rather than presuming to leadership. Many painters that were not Pre-Raphaelite in sentiment and intention, like Frith, Ritchie and Nelson O'Neil, also showed the influence of the fraternity in their use of clearer detail and the banishment of chiaroscuro. Such tendencies had of course been in evidence before the Pre-Raphaelites, for instance in the work of William Dyce, but because of the extensive debate a richly detailed surface had come to be associated almost exclusively with the new school. This proliferation of identifiably Pre-Raphaelite characteristics was no doubt instrumental in generating both adverse and evaluative criticism.

What seems clear is that the principal imperative of the continuing discourse around the work and status of the Pre-Raphaelite style was surely Ruskin's outspoken praise of Pre-Raphaelite principles. Ruskin's review of the summer exhibition selected only Pre-Raphaelite-inspired work for praise, and Millais's for special approbation: in 1855 Ruskin had described Millais's The Rescue as 'the only great picture exhibited this year'.²⁶ It is significant that both the reviewer in Fraser's and in the Eclectic Review refer extensively to Ruskin's Pre-Raphaelitism of 1851 and Lectures on Art and Painting published in 1854. The author of Modern Painters was increasingly becoming associated with the Pre-Raphaelites both in his active critical support and by direct patronage. This support is effective in linking the careers of Ruskin and selected Pre-Raphaelite painters, and the transitions in Pre-Raphaelitism can be traced through the critic's changing allegiances. Ruskin's championship of this 'new and noble school' can be viewed as constituting a meaningful departure in the nature of nineteenth-century art criticism. The symbiosis of critic and painters, of commentator and style, is a relationship on which the professional status of both ultimately rest.

In January of 1856 the Eclectic Review acknowledges the relationship between Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites by selecting his Edinburgh lectures to represent the theoretical defence of the school. The Eclectic prided itself on reviewing books in all fields of interest, hence its name, and had been founded on non-conformist principles (chiefly congregationalist) in 1805. Indeed, the Eclectic offered what Sullivan categorises as sophisticated criticism 'away from the old-fashioned techniques of quotation and abstract toward a genuine critical evaluation of books'.²⁷ Ruskin's growing professional reputation is evidenced by the nervous antagonism of the reviewer. However, while Ruskin is accused of

'greater zeal than discretion,' his pronouncements are treated with judicious care.

The following quotation is a case in point: 'We admit, with Mr Ruskin, that a spurious beauty is abroad which has become the bane of Art'. Rather than attacking Ruskin directly the reviewer tries to undermine his professionalism by denigrating the competence of the Pre-Raphaelites:

He [Holman Hunt] has no right to make his pictures disagreeable to the general eye, offensive to unsophisticated tastes, trusting to the fancied discrimination of the dilettanti few to raise a cry of acclamation in his favour. A picture that is disagreeable is bad, notwithstanding its technical merits. Paintings that require sophisticated ingenuities for their explanation, are but learned and elaborate failures.²⁸

The reviewer is seeking different terms for the debate and evaluation of modern art from those offered by Ruskin and other supporters of Pre-Raphaelitism. While Ruskin is determined that sincerity and truth to nature should be the prime targets of the modern artist this reviewer favours popular appeal and accessibility. This dichotomy is central to the changes wrought by the developing professional ideal. Ruskin is promoting a role for the professional critic as an interpreter of the specialised language of the artist.

Like Frank Stone of the Athenaeum, many of the periodical reviewers were practising artists who perhaps felt their own professionalism was under attack from the Pre-Raphaelites. But what had seemed an easy target when its spokesmen were the Rossettis, seemed less so when the voice was Ruskin's. The Pre-Raphaelite style of painting could be seen to be successfully calling traditional conventions into question, while the role of the art critic was in the process of being usurped by a new kind of specialist. It was normal for artists

with some literary ability to produce reviews on art. There were also those critics like Thackeray with considerable literary talent and some art training who had carved themselves a niche as specialist art critics. Many critics, however, were merely hacks with little specialised knowledge of art. Ruskin, while similar in type to the first two groups, was very different in degree. University educated and specialising in the study of art in considerable depth, Ruskin produced an authority in his writing that the majority of critics could never hope to emulate. The tone of the critic in the Eclectic Review is typically conservative, articulating the stable voice of reason in declaring that in 'Art we live in an age of anarchy and disorganisation'.²⁹ Feeling under threat, the Eclectic places the radical practices of Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites on trial, and the reviewer's reason quickly crumbles into emotional special pleading: 'if the plaintiffs in the suit should win, the decisions of three centuries are overthrown, ancient landmarks removed, and great names disinherited.' It must be admitted that this critic and the art he represents have some justification for fearing for their professional lives since, to ensure the professional survival of Pre-Raphaelitism, Ruskin is willing to bombard the opposing conventional style practised by the academic hacks, with his own elegant dogma.

While there can be little doubt that Ruskin was sincere in his support for Pre-Raphaelitism, the intensity of that support was in part engendered by the criticism he received for it. Ruskin was inclined to react strongly to counter those lapses of taste (any, that is, that did not perfectly reflect his own) which he perceived in the class of entrepreneurial 'Philistines'. Even those members of the middle class who humbly sought his advice were unlikely to escape his criticism. An example of Ruskin's arrogance can be found in his treatment of the leading

citizens of Bradford in his lecture 'Traffic'. Producing a display of mock humility, Ruskin characterised the Bradford bourgeoisie's invitation to lecture them on the design for their new town hall as the consultation on their part of what they perceived to be a 'respectable architectural man-milliner'. Informing the good people of Bradford that he had no interest in their town hall because they had none, Ruskin proceeded to berate them for their lack of taste.³⁰ Certainly Ruskin's defence of the PRB in his pamphlet Pre-Raphaelitism (1851) promotes the Brethren and their followers by calling into question the motives and competence of their critics:

And one of the chief reasons for the violent opposition with which the school has been attacked by other artists, is the enormous cost of care and labour which such a system demands from those who adopt it, in contradistinction to the present slovenly and imperfect style.³¹

Ruskin's polemic was at once persuasive and antagonistic. It prompted those without his skill and knowledge to enter a battlefield, Truth, on which Ruskin already held the high ground.

The author of the article in the Eclectic is reduced to a tortured disquisition on the nature of truth and beauty. As Ruskin has claimed that moral and religious truth are the primary aim of Pre-Raphaelitism and painting before Raphael, rather than mere beauty, the anonymous reviewer finds himself in the position of defending beauty as truth:

Now, everything that exists or has existed is a fact, and therefore a truth, in the most extended sense of the term. All actual beauty, which by its existence becomes a fact, is no less a truth because it is beautiful.³²

The metaphysical transformation becomes ever more convoluted, moving jerkily through types of truth and types of fact. Such contorted convolutions appear to leave Pre-Raphaelitism 'true in a scientific sense,' and conventional painting with a 'certain charm and fascination.' While he has more or less successfully claimed the 'emotions' and 'tastes' for the established art he has left Pre-Raphaelitism appearing clear, hard-edged and modern. The less disputatious article in Fraser's seems to reach a similar conclusion.

For the first seventeen years of its publication Fraser's had been a progressive magazine, without any party or factional links. But between 1847 and 1860, under the editorship of William John Parkers, it followed a broadly liberal line and aimed for a 'more sober, less combative tone'.³³ What is particularly interesting about the Fraser's article is that it avails itself of the supposedly impartial view of a French critic, Théophile Gautier. Gautier was an important and established critic in France and an early exponent of 'Art for Art's' sake. The views of this critic were gleaned from Les Beaux Arts en Europe (1855), a response to the exhibition of international art in the Paris Universal Exposition in the same year. The paintings that Gautier saw in the Exposition were Millais's The Order of Release, Ophelia, and The Return of the Dove to the Ark, and Holman Hunt's Strayed Sheep, Claudio and Isabella, and The Light of the World. The Paris exhibition of 1855 was perhaps the first opportunity that the majority of French commentators had of seeing a number of Pre-Raphaelite paintings on display. It may be that this exhibition, which associated Pre-Raphaelitism with the modern British school in an emphatic way, prompted the renewed periodical interest of 1856.

The exhibition had been noticed by the Eclectic Review but, significantly, Gautier's comments belie the Review's assertion that the Pre-Raphaelites had been greeted by mocking laughter. Gautier writes:

The three pictures of M. Millais are undoubtedly the most remarkable in the Universal Exposition, and it is impossible, even for the most careless visitor, to pass them by.³⁴

While Gautier notes a similarity to the work of the German Nazarenes, he also identifies a radical modern tendency that goes beyond those works:

Many painters of our era, especially beyond the Rhine, wavering amidst the multitude of theories, have sought 'the new in art,' but no one has pushed his system to the same extremity [as Millais].

Where British critics have found archaism, Gautier finds a startling modernity: 'by a singular power of abstraction, M. Millais has placed himself out of his age.' Gautier's response is in formal terms and evokes vividly the visual impact of Pre-Raphaelitism on an audience that did not labour under preconceptions of a narrative function in art.

It is the function of art, as well as the method used to delineate that function, which exercises British criticism (with the notable exception of Humphries), including that of Ruskin. Indeed, Ruskin is not so impressed by unique qualities in Pre-Raphaelitism as he is in the earnestness with which they pursue their objectives of 'truth to Nature' and moral narrative. While Gautier is not unaware of their examination of Nature, he remains aloof from any attempt to 'read' the message contained in these paintings. Of Holman Hunt he says: 'There is not, perhaps, in the "salon" any picture so deceiving to the eye as the Strayed Sheep; the painting which appears the falsest is precisely the most true.' What

Fraser's calls the 'offensive originality' of Pre-Raphaelite painting is given due notice, but also due regard, by Gautier in a way in which British criticism seems incapable. Gautier is prepared to evaluate Pre-Raphaelite paintings in the terms of the formal language in which they are presented. He looks for neither narrative nor charm, and because of this he is able to give deserved consideration to technical innovation. The limited accessibility of Pre-Raphaelite paintings, their impenetrability to conventional readings in their content and appearance cause problems for the less specialised British commentators. In Britain the critics and artists are polarised by opposing interpretations of Pre-Raphaelite iconography, while Gautier enjoys the apparent freedom to ignore any narrative content.

The art critics of the mid-nineteenth century had, then, noticed the Pre-Raphaelites. The critical debate that developed was certainly as concerned with the role of criticism as it was with that of painting. The critical incursions of Ruskin and the Rossettis were as influential in generating the antagonism of the art establishment as was the appearance of the Pre-Raphaelite paintings themselves. The more measured evaluation of Humphries demonstrates the existence in British criticism of an awareness of the changing nature of modern art and the growing importance of technical (rather than subjective) innovation. Perhaps more significant, however, are the views of Gautier, a French critic associated with Baudelaire and the French debate on modernity. Gautier's perception of Pre-Raphaelite paintings as both modern in appearance and execution indicates that at that time, 1855, it was possible to include Pre-Raphaelitism in a European debate on modernity in a way that did not seem possible in the first half of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, it was the nature of Ruskin's intervention in the periodical that was to prove crucial at this stage of

the emergence of professionalism. The evolution of art criticism that the debate on Pre-Raphaelitism witnesses is indicative of a developing professional ideal. It is also the case that the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood provided not only a number of individually talented artists, but also served as a training ground for sympathetic art critics. W. M. Rossetti and F. G. Stephens brought to periodical criticism the same earnestness and enthusiasm that their painter Brethren brought to art.

The years between 1848 and 1856 had seen develop around the PRB, albeit unprogrammatically, an alternative system for the establishment of professional status. Rather than an artist's fame resting on systematic Academic elevation and distinguished patronage the PRB had achieved it through controversy and notoriety. I do not suggest that such was the intention of the PRB. Indeed it is clear that they responded to the prompts and indications that were available to them in a far from revolutionary spirit. However, the effect was the same. The Brothers were known individually and as members of a school that produced recognisably different paintings. It was in this over-identification, of artist and style, that the initial success of Pre-Raphaelitism perhaps rests. I stress over-identification because Pre-Raphaelitism is far from a coherent whole either in intention or in style. Yet the diverse production of the Pre-Raphaelite artists was critically grouped in a way that minimised differences — this was particularly true of adverse criticism. Before moving on to show how the artists I have chosen responded to the debates on art that were being conducted in the periodical press I would like to spend a little time briefly considering the market for early Pre-Raphaelite works. The success of Pre-Raphaelitism as a school depended as much on the ability of the principals to earn a living as it did on social, critical and

aesthetic debates. And both market and success in art were being transformed by changing ideas on what it meant to be a professional artist.

V

The periodical debate on Pre-Raphaelitism, whatever the intentions of their critics, served to create a readily identifiable group of artists whose contemporary importance was established by the amount of interest they generated. In the nineteenth-century art market their very notoriety attracted a new sort of art buyer to them. These buyers tended to be either speculative art-dealers or successful members of the middle classes – professional, mercantile or manufacturing. The common characteristic of these patrons of Pre-Raphaelitism was that they sought, often with a passion, work that expressed values not usually found in conventional academic painting. While later patronage was more likely to generate from judgements that were made by critics on the supposed artistic merits of Pre-Raphaelite art, the first patrons of the Brotherhood seem to have been influenced by different considerations – although these considerations, too, were identified by criticism in the periodical press.

The earliest Pre-Raphaelite patrons were generally High Church and from the south of the country, in contrast to the northern patronage of later Pre-Raphaelitism. James Wyatt of Oxford, a bookseller and an acquaintance of the Millaises commissioned the artist to produce a portrait of himself and his granddaughter in 1849 but, more importantly, introduced the painter to Mr and Mrs Thomas Combe. Combe was the superintendent of the Clarendon Press in Oxford and had been responsible for its modernisation resulting in improved production and profitability. He was also closely associated with High-Church views. Known to the Brotherhood as 'the Early Christian', Thomas Combe became

one of the first Pre-Raphaelite collectors. In 1850 Combe purchased Holman Hunt's A Converted British Family Sheltering a Christian Missionary from the Persecution of the Druids (1850) and in the next few years added Collins's Convent Thoughts (1850); Millais's The Return of the Dove to the Ark (1851); and Hunt's The Light of the World (1854) to his collection. Yet the first religious Pre-Raphaelite painting to be sold was not by Hunt or Millais, neither was it sold to a member of the emergent bourgeoisie.

That painting was the Girlhood of the Virgin Mary (1849), which Rossetti sold to the Marchioness of Bath (Plate 6). The early success of a religious painting by an artist that Millais and Hunt considered a beginner was no doubt influential in encouraging the two to turn their own hands to religious subjects the next year. It was, of course, the religious aspect of Pre-Raphaelite art that became first a focus of critical abuse and then of support. The earliest critical praise for the Brotherhood was in the Tractarian Guardian. It is ironic that Rossetti's instigation should, as it did on so many occasions, lead to controversy. However, this irony is compounded if we consider how important such controversy was to establishing Pre-Raphaelitism's world-wide reputation. Hunt's early success with religious painting encouraged him to specialise in that genre and led to a comfortable, if eccentric, niche for the artist. Rossetti's prodigious sale was not an indication of an easy fortune and he had to wait longer for an income to match his expectancy and reputation. It was Millais, whose Christ in the House of His Parents had received most abuse in 1850, who also achieved the greatest financial advantage. Millais, perhaps surprisingly, was able to convert his early notoriety into a career as a 'great man' of Victorian art. Unfortunately for Millais, popular and serious art seemed to part company with the death of Dickens, and Millais's

later career was based too much on his popular appeal. Millais's defection from the Pre-Raphaelite cause, if indeed defection it was, helps to identify more clearly those areas of professionalism and middle-class masculinity that were important in forming the modern artist.

Pre-Raphaelite practice between 1848 and 1856 could be described as experimental. Rather than approaching their profession in terms of working within the existing genre or continuing, with some development, in the popular style of Wilkie, they had instead endeavoured to develop a modern expression of their art that would find a market for serious painting. The market was important for the Pre-Raphaelites. Faced with early hostility from the artistic and journalistic establishment, their progress could only be judged by the economic success that was achieved in the purchase of their paintings by sympathetic patrons.

VI

The 'great men' of Victorian culture, who coupled serious critical attention with a wide public, on the whole came from a generation earlier than Millais.

Furthermore, these were men of letters, Carlyle, Dickens and Tennyson perhaps being the most obvious examples. All three of these 'great men' were on the path to fame before Queen Victoria ascended the throne. In the fine arts we can find no one of their stature in that generation—Landseer is perhaps the closest in reputation if not in achievement. And in almost every way Millais was Landseer's successor. Like Landseer, Millais was a child prodigy and the only one of the original Pre-Raphaelites to successfully complete the academic obstacle race that would result in his being elected RA in 1863 and, eventually, President of the Royal Academy (an honour Landseer refused in 1865). Central to the discovery of the relationship between the Victorian artist's professionalism and a significant

career in modern art is the paradox of Millais's own career. How could the artist who enjoyed the adulation of his peers and the public, the highest honours a painter in Britain had received (a baronetcy) and considerable wealth, be considered a failure?

At the beginning of his association with Pre-Raphaelitism Millais appeared to show a clear understanding of what Perkin would call the professional ideal. In a letter to Mrs. Combe in 1851 Millais writes of Charles Collins:

You are not mistaken in thus believing him worthy of your kindest interests, for there are few so devotedly directed to the one thought of some day (through the medium of his art) turning the minds of men to good reflections and so heightening the profession as one of unworldly usefulness to mankind.³⁵

However, this professionalism was generated within an ideology of a changing construct of middle-class masculinity. The high minded notion of 'unworldly usefulness' is perhaps reflected in the way in which Burne-Jones becomes a painter rather than a pastor. But it is also clear that Millais's own professional career poses problems as far as his own declared, if youthful, ideals are concerned.

Millais's apparent success was that after rising to fame on the wings of the Pre-Raphaelite debate he was then accepted into the powerful art establishment. Any reading of the critical literature between 1850 and 1856 will show that it was Millais who represented the most acceptable face of Pre-Raphaelitism. This was not only true of the writings of observers such as Masson and Gautier, but also of the more partisan Ruskin. Yet while Millais was elected ARA in 1853, at the height of his Pre-Raphaelite period, he abandons the style and the support of

Ruskin by the end of that decade. Both events are clearly linked to the early popular success of such paintings as A Huguenot Refusing to Wear the Catholic Badge on the Eve of St Bartholomew (1852), the first Pre-Raphaelite painting to be published as an engraving. Yet although Millais is often portrayed as a painter who pursued popular success—rather than to continue on a less financially rewarding, if ultimately more prestigious, path—we can also read his career in terms of a developing professionalism, albeit a professionalism closely harnessed to commercial concerns.

It is significant that a style label that can encompass the work of Holman Hunt and Burne-Jones, cannot find a location for the later work of Millais.³⁶ It has to be recognised that much of the connecting tissue between separate Pre-Raphaelite artists was critical and literary rather than technical and stylistic—and foremost of those literary and critical connections was Ruskin. One major event separates Millais from Ruskin's connecting influence on Pre-Raphaelitism—and that is Millais's marriage to Ruskin's former wife, Effie Gray. Millais and Effie Gray were married on the 3 July 1855, the year following the annulment of her marriage to Ruskin on the grounds of non-consummation. Ruskin was a central figure within the critical debate that was taking place in the periodical press. It is possible to draw some conclusions about the nature of that debate and the effect of Ruskin's pro-Pre-Raphaelite intervention, from the events that surround the relationship of Ruskin and Millais. That Ruskin should continue to play an active rôle in promoting the work of Millais is perhaps not to be expected, yet, at least briefly, he does just that. His review of Autumn Leaves (1856), verges on the extravagant:

By much the most poetical work the painter has yet conceived; and also, as far as I know, the first instance of a perfectly painted twilight. It is easy, as it is common, to give obscurity to twilight, but to give the glow within its darkness is another matter; and though Giorgione might have come near the glow, he never gave the valley mist. Note also the subtle difference between the purple of the long nearer range of hills, and the blue of the distant peak emerging behind.³⁷

Yet inevitably, one almost feels, Ruskin's support is withdrawn and his treatment of Millais's work becomes increasingly critical. While it is clear that Millais's painting does indeed become ever more tailored to a popular market, it must also be the case that Ruskin found it uncongenial to support the work of a painter on whom he no longer felt himself to have any direct influence.

In place of the guidance that Millais had received from Ruskin and his Pre-Raphaelite brothers, he now had the support, and supporting, of a wife. Millais's marriage to Effie Gray effectively cut him off from the continued fellowship and advice of his associates. As the first of the Pre-Raphaelites to marry it was not surprising that there should be an alteration in his social life. Millais did not marry a girl much his junior, one he could mould into the subjected wife in the tradition of Victorian paternalism. Rather he married a woman who had already weathered such a relationship and broken with her husband; in some ways she was more than an equal in that she brought an experience of an unsatisfactory marriage to their relationship. Her diary records Millais's nervousness on their wedding night, the sickness he feels as they set off on their honeymoon.³⁸ Millais's talent had made him the focus, if not the head, of his family — and of his adopted family of Pre-Raphaelite brothers. With marriage came an obligation to be the

man, rather than the darling, of the family. As a boy Millais had been obliged to bear the weight of the ambitions of his family, the PRB and Ruskin. In marrying Effie Gray, Millais must surely have felt some of Oedipus's guilt to add some desperation to his own ambitions. It would surely not be enough to prove a better lover and husband than Ruskin, not a hard task one would suppose, but also Millais must have wanted to be a 'greater man'. Millais's dilemma, as far as the ambition to be a 'great man' was concerned, was the changing nature of the art world. The broad popularity that had enhanced, rather than devalued, the status of Tennyson and Dickens, was to become a questionable virtue in the career of a serious artist. Ruskin, if he was a 'great man', was identified as such by a discerning, rather than a wide, audience. A model for the new style of criticism, Ruskin represented the attention of the informed expert, the esoteric critic whose attention guaranteed the purity of the artist's intention.

Millais had been the first focus of Ruskin's active support for the PRB In 1851. Following his famous letter to the Times, Ruskin had met Millais and identified him as the natural successor to Turner.³⁹ Ruskin saw in Millais's apparently effortless facility the talent to provide the new British school with a worthy master. The older man made every effort to draw the young artist into a close partnership of intellect and talent, but even then Millais held back:

We are as yet singularly at variance in our opinions on Art. One of our differences is about Turner. He believes that I shall be converted on further acquaintance with his work, and I that he will gradually slacken in his admiration.⁴⁰

There were suggestions from Ruskin that he and Millais should embark on an artistic excursion to Switzerland, to visit those regions of mist and mountain that

had so moved his beloved Turner. But it was not until the unfortunate visit to Glenfinlas in 1853, that Ruskin was able to exert his full influence, only to lose both Millais and Effie.

That eventful year of 1853 provides us with the most complete Pre-Raphaelite portrait as well as the seeds of the rift between Ruskin and Millais. Millais's portrait of Ruskin, standing on the worn rocks at the Glenfinlas falls, uses the close and careful representation of nature as a complement to the personality of his sitter (Plate 7). This is not an eighteenth-century portrait where the background delineates the external attributes of the sitter's life. Indeed this is a psychological study that leaves Millais's previous portraiture, such as that of the Wyatt family, far behind. Millais has placed Ruskin among eroded rocks and torrents of water, a Turneresque setting for which Ruskin himself provided some of the studies. In the portrait Ruskin stands complacently above the reforming passion of the white water, looking contemplatively downstream. He is, one feels, less malleable, and less feeling, than the solid rock on which he stands. It was while Millais painted this portrait that his attachment to Ruskin's wife, Effie, began to grow. In the months that followed the trip to Scotland, Millais came to view Ruskin as a man without those essential feelings of sympathy and sentiment for a wife that the ideal husband must have. In a letter to Mrs. Gray, Millais defends the innocence of his correspondence with her daughter. He assures Effie's mother that Ruskin knows and approves of their communications. The letter, written on 19 December 1853, goes as far as to suggest that Ruskin was plotting the disgrace of his own wife. In Millais's words:

His absence in the Highlands seemed purposely to give me an opportunity of being in his wife's society — His wickedness must be

without parallel, if he kept himself away, to the end that has come about, as I am sometimes inclined to think, altogether his conduct is incomprehensible . . . The worst of all is the wretchedness of her position, whenever they go to visit she will be left to herself in the company of any stranger present, for Ruskin appears to delight in selfish solitude.⁴¹

She is a heroine who is locked behind the dark walls of a loveless marriage. Their eventual union, after the scandal of Effie's and Ruskin's annulment, also marks the separation of Millais from Ruskin, and – what is more – the beginning of professional separation from the PRB.

Millais did not abandon all his links to Pre-Raphaelitism with his social isolation from Ruskin. Indeed at least one of the paintings he produces after that break comes nearest to ensuring the continuity of Millais's link to modernism. In producing Autumn Leaves (during 1855 – 6), Millais shows himself capable of treating his preferred subjects without descending to literal sentimentality (Plate 8). Autumn Leaves is a painting that looks forward to Aestheticism in its influence on Whistler and also reminds us of Théophile Gautier's enthusiasm for Millais as a modern painter (expressed in France in 1855 and repeated in Britain in 1856). Autumn Leaves is also the Pre-Raphaelite painting that comes most nearly to Gautier's enthusiasm for 'Art for Art's sake' in its lack of clear narrative intention. It has indeed been suggested that this is a painting without a subject. At this point, then, Millais was still closely in touch with the aesthetic and professional developments that were affecting the perception of the great artist. The 'new professionalism' stressed the right of the artist to produce art without a

clear message or moral, in a similar way to the scientists who were promoting their claims for the importance of pure research.

The only reason that Autumn Leaves existed, it has been said, was because of Millais's desire to visually express his personal aesthetic. This interpretation appears to come from certain notes that appeared in his wife's diary. Effie Millais wrote in her journal: 'He [Millais] wished to paint a picture full of beauty and without subject..⁴² It has been supposed, presumably because of its enigmatic quality, that Autumn Leaves is that painting. Certainly this is a painting in which the young bride appears to have taken much interest—as much, according to the testimony of her son, as she did in the rest of Millais's professional life, organising his ledgers, correspondence and his visitors. Newly married to a talented artist, Effie lent her female sensibilities to the choice of models for the painting. The models were two of Effie's younger sisters and two girls from a local charity school—selected for their good looks. While his wife was very efficient in assisting him with the practical problems associated with the production of this painting it is probable that Millais missed the advice and discussion that he could have expected from his fellow professionals, as his letters show he did in earlier periods of isolation. For although Autumn Leaves surely looks forward to an emerging modernism, it just as surely contains the seeds of Millais's later, deleterious, sentimentality.

At the time of painting Autumn Leaves Millais was, as Malcolm Warner demonstrates, taking an uncharacteristic interest in the theoretical aspects of art, especially in the nature of 'Beauty'.⁴³ Millais wrote in a letter to Charles Collins that the 'only head you could paint to be considered beautiful by everybody would be the face of a little girl about eight years old, before humanity is subject

to much change.' Yet this painting is not simply about beauty, although beauty's transience is an integral part of its symbolism. The bittersweet briefness of life itself is the subject of the painting. To be sure, this painting is a long way from the sentimental subject paintings of Millais's popular period such as My First Sermon, exhibited in 1863, the year he became a full member of the Royal Academy. Yet this belief in the essential beauty and purity of childhood is of course a recurring theme in his work from that period, and it is an ideology that enjoys wide acceptance throughout the period, even after it has become a stale cliché. Peter Coveney traced the literary source of such images to the 'Romantic Child' and the 'Cult of Sensibility', but the use of such metaphors had decayed into absurdity by the time Mrs. Henry Wood's East Lynne was published in 1861.⁴⁴ While Autumn Leaves might be felt to contain the vestiges of that earlier romantic vitality, and yet, in some ways, appear to hint at the corrupted innocence of Aestheticism, it can also be interpreted as an archetypal Victorian treatment. In Coveney's words: 'The Victorians seem to have taken to themselves the romantic image of childhood, and negated its power. The image is transfigured into the image of an innocence which dies'.⁴⁵ Millais, in a letter to F. G. Stephens that followed the critic's review of Autumn Leaves in the Crayon, wrote: 'I have always felt insulted when people regarded it as a simple little domestic episode, chosen for effect, and colour.' The artist maintained that he intended the painting to show, 'by its solemnity[,] the deepest religious reflection'.⁴⁶ In its surface beauty, Autumn Leaves looks forward to Aestheticism, its relevance to the new professional ideal supported by its enigmatic treatment. Yet it is clear from Millais's remarks that he was not sensitive to the changing standards of critical evaluation. The literary and interpretative skills that had

marked early Pre-Raphaelite production, and which Millais was generally felt to lack in comparison with Hunt and Rossetti, were no longer so important. Had Millais pursued the formal, rather than the sentimental, character of Autumn Leaves, his career might well have been different. In choosing to emphasise narrative and sentiment, Millais ensured his popular and commercial success, but undermined his claims to be a serious artist.

Although it is clear that Millais had a mind and ideas of his own it is also evident that his work always inclined to a prettiness that Pre-Raphaelite influences tended to subdue. After the separation of the artist from the direct influence of Ruskin – and Hunt because of that artist's visit to the Holy Land – Millais became much more dependent on the popular reception of his paintings. In 1856, however, there was still a good deal of harsh criticism in the press. Although adverse notices were now off-set by a greater number of more positive reviews it was increasingly the general print-buying public who gave Millais most professional satisfaction. It is clear from the letters in his son's biography of the artist that Millais at this time derives great reassurance from the large prices his paintings fetch and the sales of the engraving of the Huguenot picture:

Nothing could have been more adverse than the criticism on The Huguenot, yet the engraving is now selling more rapidly than any other of recent times. I have great faith in the mass of the public . . .⁴⁷

His ability to support his family in a fine manner, and the loyalty and devoted interest of his wife, encouraged Millais to continue seeking popularity and commercial gain in preference to serious critical approval. Material success is important to Millais's evaluation of his own and other work, he writes of Holman Hunt in the same letter:

Poor Hunt, though well praised in the Press, has not found a purchaser for his Scapegoat, in spite of the lowness of the price he asks. A very highly finished picture, too, and twice the size of my largest [my emphasis].

Millais cannot hide the satisfaction he feels for the concrete and monetary rewards that his work attracts, and holds them closer to him than the critical approval of his peers. Yet it was in the nature of the critical debate on Pre-Raphaelitism that we can begin to see the changes that are emerging in the professional pursuit of art.

With more technical skill and talent than the other Pre-Raphaelites, Millais benefited most from the notoriety created by the acrimonious periodical debate—and Ruskin's initial involvement with the PRB. However, the accident of Millais's estrangement from Ruskin isolated the artist from the support of the group, both in terms of criticism and fellowship. The attacks from conservative critics continued and support from Pre-Raphaelite sympathisers lessened and so Millais adapted to a more conventional career, although one modified by the effects of the entrepreneurial ideal. The models of 'great men' like Dickens and Tennyson, seemed to hold the promise that popular fame and wealth could lead to critical approval in time. The choices that Millais made were clearly linked to his position as a family man and the need to establish an individual and dominant position for himself among his peers. But the choices he could have made were limited and his problems, given the changing nature of art and the art market, complex. Indeed, what were the alternatives to 'great manhood' that the development of the professional ideal and modernism were offering? Already a new generation of Pre-Raphaelite artists were appearing whose training in art would be very

different from Millais's traditional art education. And this new generation comprised those very nearly Millais's chronological contemporaries. Millais's professional career had started some eight or nine years earlier when Millais's first painting hung in the Royal Academy exhibition (although we should not forget the many years of practical training in the Academy schools). Burne-Jones, only then at the beginning of his career, was just four years younger. Significantly, another four years had been spent acquiring a university education.

VII

In 1856 Edward Burne-Jones and William Morris, with several other recent graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, published a small magazine called, understandably but rather unimaginatively, the Oxford and Cambridge Magazine. Morris financed the venture and he and Burne-Jones were responsible for the majority of the articles, stories and poems printed in the journal. The relevance of the magazine lies not so much in any similarity to The Germ, which is tenuous, as to the association of the two principals to the further diversification of Pre-Raphaelitism. In this respect there is evidence of a development not only in the way Pre-Raphaelitism is perceived, but also in the nature and standing of the professional artist. It is an article by Burne-Jones, ostensibly on Thackeray's novel The Newcomes (1855), which most clearly involves itself with the debate on the nature of the professional artist—and whether a 'University Man' could become an artist and remain a gentleman.

Burne-Jones's review of The Newcomes signposts a deviation by a slightly younger generation away from truth to external Nature, typified by the work of Holman Hunt, to what was perceived as an inner truth to the nature of man. The model for this form of expression was, for Burne-Jones, to be found in the work of

Rossetti. While Burne-Jones is clearly in sympathy with the earnest nature of early Pre-Raphaelitism, it is a sympathy tinged with awe for an already established authority. He writes:

I cannot but feel hopefully, speak hopefully for the present and the coming years and their hidden destiny; cannot, above all, but speak thankfully and with deepest reverence for such great names as Tennyson and Holman Hunt, Ruskin and Carlyle, and Kingsley, and many others who have led on this most godly crusade against falsehood, doubt, and wretched fashion.⁴⁸

Burne-Jones's primary aesthetic inclinations are, however, reserved for a Pre-Raphaelite brother other than Holman Hunt, one perhaps a little less at home with the 'muscular Christians' mentioned above. Burne-Jones writes of the illustrator of William Allingham's recently published (in late 1855) Day and Night Songs, that his is:

the most beautiful drawing for an illustration I have ever seen, the weird faces of the maids of Elfinmere. . . Why is the author of 'The Blessed Demosel' [sic], and the story of Chiaro, so seldom on the lips of men? If only we could hear him oftener, live in the light of his power a little longer.

Rossetti had ceased publicly exhibiting his paintings in 1850 and had, therefore, received little attention in the reviewing press. Neither had his poetry been commercially published since the demise of The Germ. Yet this romantic strain of Pre-Raphaelitism was easily borne and scattered abroad by The Germ. Rossetti's works may not have been presented for public criticism in the periodicals but his poems and illustrations still circulated for all to see and read.

Central to Burne-Jones's interest in The Newcomes is the novel's discussion of the suitability of art as a profession for a gentleman – which reflects Burne-Jones's own preoccupation at that time. Clive Newcome, the young hero, is a gentleman who is determined to become a professional artist. This is a turn of events that even his indulgent father cannot take lightly. According to Burne-Jones, Colonel Newcome is all in favour of an accomplished amateurism for Clive, but not a professional commitment, he:

Can understand him adopting it for amusements sake, refined dilettantism; but to be a painter by profession – to live by the labour of his hands so, this he cannot comprehend, this society and immaculate respectability cannot endure.⁴⁹

The idea of an 'immaculate respectability' certainly sounds odd today. The use of the word 'immaculate', so often used in connection with the Virgin, seems to elevate the idea of 'respectability' to the level of a nearly divine virtue. Perhaps in this striking juxtaposition of terms we gain an insight into the emergence of the professional ideal. The review is ostensibly about Thackeray's treatment of marriage and the writer seems to be making a parallel between Clive's poor choice of partner with his lack of understanding of what it takes to be an artist. Yet Burne-Jones suggests that Clive shows a certain strength of purpose in pursuing this career, a strength of purpose not so evident in his romantic and marital affairs. Clive does not marry where his heart directs him, 'Clive was not in love with her – loved some one else too surely, and, knowing this, it was an evil step to take.' Yet in the selection of a career Clive Newcome has apparently made the correct choice:

our work, whatsoever it be, must be the best of its kind, the noblest we can offer. So the former question frames itself anew: 'What is the best that any man can give?' And God has given us an answer, 'that in which he finds most happiness'.⁵⁰

Burne-Jones is surely preparing his own argument for assuming the role of artist. The language and arguments used cannot help but remind us of those of Carlyle and Ruskin that influenced the production of Brown's Work, which, of course, he was beginning at this time. The article, then, reconciles the problem of 'immaculate respectability' by establishing that it is subordinate to the God given happiness of suitable work. Burne-Jones is satisfied that it is fitting for a university man to become an artist.

Burne-Jones had himself originally intended to serve society in the role of clergyman. While there can be little doubt that the work, education and effort required to turn a beggarly flower-seller into an artist would only be to the good of society it is significant that Burne-Jones could now also be convinced that the practice of art would offer similar social and spiritual rewards as a call to the cloth. Surely this is evidence of a revised estimation of the value of the artist to society. As a graduate of Oxford Burne-Jones was in a position to join one of the learned professions and establish himself at a secure and recognised social level. Edward Richard Jones, the artist's father, was a frame maker in Birmingham; although he employed others he had neither genteel status nor a large fortune. Although the business, which included carving and gilding, provided a degree of comfort and paid Burne-Jones's way through university, his father's relaxed way of business precluded the likelihood of any social elevation due to wealth. For Burne-Jones to consider a career as an artist suggests that there has been some

development in the way that the role of the artist, and his relationship to male middle-class professionalism, could be viewed compared, for instance, with Holman Hunt's representation of the profession (published in 1905) as he perceived it to be in the 1840s:

Up to that day [reading Ruskin's Modern Painters] I had been compelled to think that the sober modern world tolerated art only as a sort of vagabondish cleverness, that in England it was a disgrace, charitably modified in very exceptional cases, to have a professional passion for it, and that if toleration of it lingered at all, it would not be in intellectual and elevated circles.⁵¹

There can be little doubt that Burne-Jones's belief that the status of the artist was increasing was at least partly due to the level of debate on modern art, and especially the role that Ruskin played within that debate. This is a view that would also seem to be supported by Holman Hunt's testimony.

While Rossetti appeals to Burne-Jones's imagination it is Ruskin who speaks to the 'University Man'. As a disciple of Carlyle, Burne-Jones could not help but indulge in the Victorian delight in hero-worship. Ruskin was his hero, and, like Rossetti, befriended Burne-Jones during 1856. Burne-Jones had read Ruskin since his schooldays at King Edward's School, Birmingham, and found the reality of becoming his intimate at first overwhelming. He wrote:

To-night he comes down to our rooms to carry off my drawing and shew it to lots of people; to-morrow night he comes again, and every Thursday night the same— isn't it like a dream? think of knowing Ruskin like an equal and being called his dear boys. Oh! he is so good

and kind – better than his books, which are the best books in the world.⁵²

Ruskin, another graduate of Oxford, championed the cause of a moral and socially important modern art, he had also gone a long way to producing an intellectually respectable way of thinking about art. A climate had been produced, by the Pre-Raphaelite debate, which made it not seem unreasonable for a university man to take up a brush and paint.

In an article written in 1866 on the subject of Christian art the Reverend St John Tyrwhitt, makes some interesting observations on the university education of certain artists:

the Universities seem to produce their share of Painters. The names of Burne-Jones, Spencer Stanhope and Alfred Hunt (all Oxford men), are sufficiently well known for originality and power: and there are many more.⁵³

In the article Tyrwhitt begins by discussing the nature of Christian art but develops his argument into a debate on the proper professional education for artists. On the question of the artist's education, he writes:

We do not know if it will come to pass in our time that either of the Universities will consider art a sufficiently important means of general education to deserve encouragement as a recognised study. It would be a certain means of raising the aspirations of all painters, by filling their ranks with well-read and severely trained men, who would choose subjects worthy of a man's thought.⁵⁴

But, as the writer has already noted, the 1850s had begun to see a significant number of university educated men taking up the profession of artist.

What is perhaps more significant is that the three artists that Tyrwhitt mentions, Burne-Jones, Spencer Stanhope and Alfred Hunt, are all painters associated with the later Pre-Raphaelite style. Tyrwhitt's discussion of the professional education of artists follows, rather than predicts, a tendency that was already becoming evident—a growing status of artists that is not dependent on the honours bestowed by the Royal Academy. In company with William Morris, these artists form a small but important group of university educated men who view the practice of modern art as worthy of their professional interest. Pre-Raphaelitism and Ruskin had apparently elevated the regard in which the profession of artist was held. Furthermore, we also see the appearance of different criteria by which to judge the professional life of the successful modern artist. Some of the responsibility—or credit—for these changes may lie at the doors of the Royal Academy. In spite of their apparent willingness to allow the work of the original PRB an audience, the Royal Academicians seemed reluctant to honour the success of the Pre-Raphaelite style. With the exception of Millais, the Academy was slow to offer membership to any artist associated with the new modern style.

In 1857 a number of artists loosely allied to the Pre-Raphaelites were still being refused admission to membership of the Royal Academy. Holman Hunt had ceased to apply after two refusals and Linnell, Watts, Madox Brown, Rossetti and Leighton were denied admittance in that year. Their response was to form an exhibiting society, the Hogarth Club, to put their work before the public. Burne-Jones and Spencer Stanhope, two of the university men, were largely instrumental in arranging the detail of the club's inception. All four of the university men, Burne-Jones, Morris, Alfred Hunt and Spencer Stanhope, became members of the Hogarth Club, which began its life in 1858. The membership of the club revolved,

significantly, around Rossetti and the Pre-Raphaelite circle. Of the three principal members of the original PRB only Millais, already an ARA, was not a member: John Ruskin was also a member. When Burne-Jones was eventually offered associate membership of the RA in 1885 he accepted reluctantly, and resigned in 1893 having exhibited only one painting (in 1886).⁵⁵

Burne-Jones contemplates a career as a professional artist in a spirit of optimism and rightness. This equanimity has, in part, been made possible for him by the level of debate which has been generated by the emergence of Pre-Raphaelitism and the earnestness which that debate seems to testify to in Pre-Raphaelite artists. The 'immaculate respectability' of the PRB is underwritten by the intellectual stature of Ruskin, for Burne-Jones as it was for Holman Hunt. Respectability, however, is only what makes the life of a professional artist possible for a 'University Man'—it does not make it necessarily desirable. It is the 'light' and 'power' of Rossetti's achievements that make the work of the artist seem so beguiling—light and power that, to Burne-Jones, is being kept from its rightful public space. The influence that Rossetti had was important not only to the further growth of the Pre-Raphaelite movement, but also in establishing his own reputation. Yet Rossetti's influence and reputation appear to grow without recourse to the established art institutions and—at this early stage—without fame or financial success. Knowledge of how this was possible is helpful in understanding the emergence of the professional ideal.

VIII

While financial success could more or less ensure social elevation and a gentlemanly education could suggest respectability, professional struggle and a certain (if limited) degree of poverty could be expected by the majority of artists

at the beginning of their careers. The technical and intellectual opposition that Pre-Raphaelitism generated produced a credible modern professionalism widely discussed in the press. The structure of the original Brotherhood, and the widening network of artistic sympathisers and disciples could provide a model of a professional and intellectual support system. In the absence of more tangible evidence of success such a system could help to establish a professional reputation. However, the sympathy of one's peers could not disguise the irregularity and relative poverty of the struggling artist's way of life.

The irregular status of the artist was addressed by affording him a unique position in society. The painter, poet and playwright earned temporary, or even lifelong, dispensation from the imperative to (in the idiom of the Birmingham businessman) 'get on', and get on respectably, on the acknowledged basis of their 'genius'. The tolerance for the 'outsider' artist or genius, while it was a product of Romanticism, almost certainly became more influential as it became naturalised during the course of the nineteenth century. William Blake (1757-1827), who was anti-Academy and practised an anti-academic art, was afforded little status in his lifetime and his later veneration was very much part of the development of the idea of the isolated genius. Tom Gretton (1986) expresses this tendency in the following way:

Over the last century and a half concepts such as that of Bohemia have been much more successful in constituting the public persona 'artist' than the earnest attempts of a large number of painters and so forth over the same period to live 'bourgeois' lives, and to convince the world of the respectability, of the ordinariness of the profession.

Painters and so forth are stereotyped as special people, as 'artists'.⁵⁶

Such status was the ultimate product of 'individualism', the bourgeois construction of the subject so characteristic of Romanticism. The economic 'progress' of the entrepreneurial class, according to this Marxist style of analysis, promoted the subjection of the alienated 'individual'. But it is Romanticism that makes a virtue of that alienation and professionalism which constructs an ideology from which, at its extreme boundaries, the 'outsider' may criticise the alienating entrepreneurial ideal. While the respectable middle classes may not accept an absolute freedom of the individual, by the 1850s they were beginning to find themselves ideologically bound to grant it to genius. It is in this context that we witness the paradox of the artist who enjoys a 'reputation' without the material success to support it.

Of the Pre-Raphaelites, Rossetti is the painter who most closely fits this model of high reputation, at least among the cognoscenti, with lack of material success. Rossetti was more or less supported by the generosity of his brother William, and the patronage of Ruskin. Only gradually did Rossetti's high reputation begin to generate a wider patronage and a little more financial security. Thus Rossetti would appear to exist within that realm of British art of which Thackeray's narrator writes, in The Newcomes:

British art either finds her peculiar nourishment in melancholy, and loves to fix her abode in desert places; or, it may be, her purse is but slenderly furnished, and she is forced to put up with accommodations rejected by more prosperous callings. Some of the most dismal quarters in town are colonised by her disciples and professors.⁵⁷

This passage begins the chapter entitled 'A School of Art', and describes the nature and method of Clive and J. J.'s first formal art education under the failed

History Painter Gandish. In it Thackeray's narrator describes the poverty and work of aspiring artists. The society of students is impolite, even coarse, drawn from different classes and all parts of the Kingdom. Their poverty prevents the majority from maintaining a respectable middle-class life-style – yet they present themselves as gentlemen. To an extent this is part of the dilemma of the artist in the Victorian period. The profession of artist is considered, at least marginally, as gentlemanly; in so far as the well off and comfortable artist may maintain a gentleman's existence. Yet the period of apprenticeship is long, and the rewards by no means certain.

The term 'Bohemian' has its roots in the French word for gypsy, and it is in the 'Latin Quarter' of Paris that the stereotypical 'Bohemian' society develops during the first half of the nineteenth century. Thackeray played a large part in introducing and promoting the idea of bohemianism to the early Victorians through his articles in Fraser's Magazine from the late 1830s. The writer's early aspirations to paint had sent him to Paris while his inability to earn money in that trade, and the squandering of his inheritance, pushed him to make a living through journalism. In 1840 Thackeray wrote of Paris:

The life of the young painter here is the easiest, merriest, dirtiest existence possible. He comes to Paris, probably at sixteen, from his province; his parents settle forty pounds a year on him, and pay his master; he establishes himself in the Pays Latin, or in the new quarter of Notre Dame de Lorette (which is quite peopled with painters); he arrives at his atelier at a tolerably early hour, and labours among a score of companions as merry and poor as himself. Each gentleman has his favourite tobacco pipe; and the pictures are painted in the midst of

a cloud of smoke, and a din of puns and choice French slang, and a roar of choruses, of which no one can form an idea who has not been present at such an assembly.⁵⁸

Thackeray bemoans the lack of such ateliers in London, but by the 1850s is able to describe Gandish's, drawing for his model on the development of two schools, Sass's and Leigh's, that gave instruction to aspirants to the Academy schools.

With this foundation Thackeray is able to create an English bohemia in 'Soho or Bloomsbury'. Sass's certainly already existed as a school in the 1830's, as W. P. Frith was a student at that time, but Frith's description of it does not contain so much the glamour of bohemia as the flavour of a Dickensian counting house.⁵⁹

While the aim of the artist, as we can see from the several biographies and autobiographies of the Pre-Raphaelites and others, may have been to aspire to a respectable bourgeois life, the popular imagination has them living this bohemian life—if only in the early years of their careers. And we might wonder if artists would have gained any advantage if they had been able to convince the public that the artist's was an ordinary middle-class existence. Bohemianism offered glamour and status, and so it might be described as a licensed lack of respectability.

This fiction of a romantic poverty has its advantages for both artist and society; it maintains the status of the artist as cheaply as possible. In effect, by his acceptance of poverty, the artist subsidises a wider proliferation of artistic practice than the market is otherwise willing to maintain. In return for this the artist is offered a limited social acceptance until he either succeeds or fails. The failure of the studio system and of patronage as responses to the growth of capitalism create the economic conditions that encourage the growth of

bohemianism. It is an idea born in Romanticism to glamorise the artistic life, tailored and dispersed by writers, actors and painters. While 'Gandish' is viewed as a laughable failure by his generation, Rossetti is seen, by his own supporters and the generations that came after, as having cultivated a fragile genius in bohemian isolation.

Like the university graduate, the bohemian was an identity that was appropriate only to the middle-class male. Although the informal art schools, unlike the Royal Academy schools which barred women until 1860, increasingly found a place for women artists, both bohemianism and professionalism tended to be antipathetic to middle-class femininity. Eliza Fox, a Unitarian intellectual, attended Sass's art school between 1844 and 1847 but found it expedient to run her own classes for women from the late 1840s because of the tendency for women to be treated as amateurs.⁶⁰ The original intention of these British art schools was to prepare students for admission to the Academy schools. Following the example of Rossetti, Burne-Jones attended one of these schools, Leigh's—later known as Heatherley's (not Gandish's, as Harrison and Waters suggest; that school was a product of Thackeray's imagination although purportedly based on Leigh's). Leigh's was popular with a number of the artists associated with Pre-Raphaelitism, a fact perhaps due to the influence of one of the founders, J. R. Herbert, an artist of deep religious conviction early influenced by the German Nazarenes. But unlike the generation of Pre-Raphaelites ten years earlier Burne-Jones and William Morris made no attempt to undertake the lengthy academic training. The experience of Pre-Raphaelitism had made that particular rite of passage an irrelevancy. Rossetti served as a model of an alternative professionalism for those younger painters. An example of the gifted individual

who avoids the deadening and creatively dangerous path through the academic halls of an out-dated conventionalism.

We can see that the periodical press helped to establish a debate on the nature and consumption of modern art. Pre-Raphaelitism was accorded what could realistically be called an alternative space within that debate. Furthermore, a more romantic and evocative image of the artist was being constructed in the periodical press, largely by Thackeray, that gave the bohemian (in spite of a rather risqué reputation) an aura of unworldly virtue. This disassociation from the marketplace establishes the artist's importance to the new professional ideal. The glamour of Bohemia seems at variance with Burne-Jones's preoccupation with respectability but is in fact allied to it. However, although the debate on Pre-Raphaelitism was important in establishing the group as an identifiable site of modernism such identification alone was not sufficient to ensure the further development and survival of the movement. The conceptual space that the critical controversy around Pre-Raphaelitism had created needed to be actualised. Real spaces and real institutions were needed that were not of the establishment or old society. Millais's determination to work within the suspect institution of the Royal Academy must surely have been partly responsible for his split with Pre-Raphaelitism. The issue of institutions and spaces, and the cultural formations that they reflected, is to be the concern of the following chapters.

Notes to Chapter Two

¹ John S. North in J. Don Vann and Rosemary T. Van Arsdell, eds., Victorian Periodicals: a Guide to Research (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1978), 3.

² Ibid., 4.

³ Harold Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society (London: Routledge, 1969), 290.

⁴ The Morning Chronicle took up a Whiggish stance under Black's editorship in about 1835, before that it was a Tory organ. It was with the newly Benthamite Chronicle that Charles Dickens began his journalistic career.

⁵ Edwin R. A. Seligman, editor, Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 15 (New York: Macmillan, 1962), 322-23.

⁶ W. J. Reader, Professional Men (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966), 4.

⁷ Harold Perkin, Origins of Modern English Society, 291.

⁸ For instance, the Builder for 1 June 1850 carried a review of the Royal Academy exhibition and on 13 September 1851 a review of Ruskin's Pre-Raphaelitism.

⁹ Frank Mort, Dangerous Sexualities: medico-moral politics in England from 1830 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), 51.

¹⁰ Although Hunt perhaps clung to the wet white technique longer than Millais, he certainly retouched The Awakening Conscience (1853-4) in 1856 at the behest of its purchaser, Thomas Fairburn. While Hunt makes much of the technique in Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood (1905) I believe that its use was restricted to increasingly limited areas of his painting from the early 1850s. For example, Hunt's Claudio and Isabella (1850–53) in the Tate Gallery shows the compositional advantages of limiting the areas on a white ground to those, like the window and Isabella's face, that are painted in brilliant contrast to the much darker cell and Claudio.

¹¹ Art-Journal 11 (1849), 171.

¹² The Original, A Periodical established by A Few Young Men as an Amusement For Their Leisure Hours (Liverpool: The Albion Office, 1849).

¹³ John Seward [F. G. Stephens], 'The Purpose and Tendency of Early Italian Art', The Germ, 2 (February 1850), 61.

¹⁴ William Michael Rossetti, '2 February, 1850', The PRB Journal (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 50-1.

¹⁵ Brian Dobbs and Judy Dobbs, Dante Gabriel Rossetti: An Alien Victorian (London: Macdonald and Jane's, 1977, 67-8.

¹⁶ William Michael Rossetti, The PRB Journal: William Michael Rossetti's Diary of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood 1849-1853, edited by William E. Fredeman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), 31-32.

¹⁷ Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Critic (1 March 1850), cited in Brian Dobbs and Judy Dobbs, Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1977), 68.

¹⁸ W. M. Rossetti, The PRB Journal, 59.

¹⁹ The Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites (London: Penguin Books: 1984), 121.

²⁰ Angus B. Reach, 'Town Talk and Table Talk', Illustrated London News (4 May 1850), 306.

²¹ David Masson, 'Pre-Raphaelitism in Art and Literature', British Quarterly Review, 16 (August 1852), 213.

²² Henry Noel Humphries, Ten Centuries of Art: its Progress in Europe from the IXth to the XIXth Century (London: Grant and Griffith, 1852), 61.

²³ *Ibid.*, 62.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 64.

-
- ²⁵ Edward Young MA., Pre-Raffaellitism; or, A Popular Enquiry into some Newly-Asserted Principles connected with the Philosophy, Poetry, Religion, and Revolution of Art (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1857), 181.
- ²⁶ John Ruskin, 'Academy Notes of 1855', Pre-Raphaelitism, Lectures on Architecture and Painting (London: J. M. Dent, n.d.), 189.
- ²⁷ Alvin Sullivan, British Literary Magazines: the Romantic Age 1789 – 1836 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1983), 124.
- ²⁸ Eclectic Review (January 1856), 6.
- ²⁹ Ibid., 1.
- ³⁰ John Ruskin, The Crown of Wild Olives (Kent: George Allen, 1886), 73.
- ³¹ John Ruskin, 'Pre-Raphaelitism', Pre-Raphaelitism, ed. James Sambrook (London: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 99.
- ³² Eclectic Review (January 1856), 16.
- ³³ Alvin Sullivan, British Literary Magazines: 1789 – 1836, 173.
- ³⁴ A. Y. – R. S., 'Pre-Raphaelitism from Different Points of View', Fraser's Magazine, vol. 53 (London: June 1856), 691.
- ³⁵ John Guille Millais, The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais P. R. A., 1:103.
- ³⁶ John Guille Millais suggests that the principal reason for this is that Pre-Raphaelitism is erroneously associated with the later style of Rossetti and that this work, and that of Burne-Jones et al, would be better called 'Rossettism.'
- ³⁷ John Ruskin, 'Royal Academy Notes 1856', Pre-Raphaelitism (Everyman's Press), 220.

³⁸ Effie Millais wrote in her diary:

he [Millais] cried dreadfully [on their wedding night], said he did not know how he got through it, felt wretched; it had added ten years to his life and instead of being happy and cheerful he seemed in despair'.

Cited in Jan Marsh, The Pre-Raphaelite Sisterhood (London: Quartet Books, 1985), 84.

³⁹ Hilton, Pre-Raphaelites, 68.

⁴⁰ Millais to Mrs Thomas Combe, 2 July 1851, J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:116-21.

⁴¹ Admiral Sir William James, ed. The Order of Release (London: John Murray, 1947), 207.

⁴² Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites (1984), 141.

⁴³ Malcolm Warner, 'John Everett Millais's Autumn Leaves: "a picture full of beauty and without subject",' in Leslie Parris ed., Pre-Raphaelite Papers (Tate Gallery, 1984), 137.

⁴⁴ Peter Coveney, Poor Monkey (London: Rockliff, 1957), 136.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 149.

⁴⁶ F. G. Stephens Papers, Bodleian. MSS.DON.e. 57:31.

⁴⁷ Millais to Effie Millais, 8 May, in 1856, J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:303.

⁴⁸ Edward Burne-Jones, 'Essay on The Newcomes', Oxford and Cambridge Magazine (January 1856), 50.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 56.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 57.

⁵¹ William Holman Hunt, Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, 2 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1905), 1:73.

⁵² John Christian, "'A Serious Talk': Ruskin's Place in Burne-Jones's Artistic Development,' in Pre-Raphaelite Papers, 184.

⁵³ Rev. St John Tyrwhitt, 'Ancilla Domini: Thoughts on Christian Art', Contemporary Review (September-December 1866), 79. In Pictorial Art, published in 1868, Tyrwhitt writes in the preface of his obligation to Ruskin – for whom Tyrwhitt acted as secretary – as a teacher and patron.

⁵⁴ Tyrwhitt, 'Ancilla Domini', Contemporary Review, 182.

⁵⁵ Martin Harrison and Bill Waters, Burne-Jones (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1973), 36-7.

⁵⁶ Tom Gretton, 'New Lamps for Old', in The New Art History, ed. A. L. Rees and Frances Borzello, London: Camden Press, 1986, cited in Christine Battersby, Gender and Genius: Towards a Feminist Aesthetics [1989] (London: The Women's Press, 1994), 200. It is also interesting to note that Dante Gabriel Rossetti was among those impressed by Blake; in 1845 he was able to purchase from the British Museum one of Blake's more important note-books, that included his annotation of Reynolds's Discourses, for the sum of ten shillings.

⁵⁷ William Makepeace Thackeray, The Newcomes, 2 vols. (1855; reprint London: Smith, Elder, 1886), 1:185.

⁵⁸ William Makepeace Thackeray, 'On the French School of Painting', The Paris Sketch Book [1840] (London: Caxton, n. d.), 206.

⁵⁹ William Powell Frith, My Autobiography and Reminiscences (1888), 23-40.

⁶⁰ Deborah Cherry, Painting Women: Victorian Women Artists (London: Routledge, 1993), 55.

3 Exhibiting Professionalism

I

Notwithstanding the abundant immaturity to be detected in some of them, we confess that we do not remember to have seen any equally numerous collection of modern pictures equally distinguished by the property we mean—namely, that resulting from the artist's simple and sincere endeavour to render his genuine and independent impressions of nature.¹

These generally approving but clearly qualified sentiments formed part of a notice in the Saturday Review that greeted an exhibition held in two rooms of a private house in 1857. Like the house, the exhibition too was private. It was the first exhibition that a number of artists, loosely affiliated by the term Pre-Raphaelite, had held as a body. While exhibitions organised by groups of artists were not unknown, such exhibitions—like those of the Water Colour Society, The Birmingham Society of Artists and the Liverpool Academy—did not reflect a programme of stylistic unity. Those various institutes and societies were, however, certainly specialised unions intended to enhance the status of their members and their profession. The development of these societies was related to the rise of professionalism because, as Harold Perkin writes:

Specialisation leads directly to professionalism. Specialists rapidly form guilds, associations, clubs or unions to enhance their status, protect their skills from competition, and increase their incomes.²

It should be noted that the characteristics of professional specialism run counter to the entrepreneurial ideal of the free market in a desire to control competition and to reserve for the professional, rather than the consumer, the right to set a value on skills and services.

The exhibitions of provincial and technical groups, nevertheless, differed from that of the Pre-Raphaelites in the nature and degree of their specialisation. In this chapter I intend to concentrate on the 'associative' aspect of specialisation and identify what might be termed 'Pre-Raphaelite exhibition programmes'. These programmes span a wide range of activities from Millais's direct, and relatively traditional, assault on the Royal Academy, to Rossetti's reclusive and very private relationship with patrons, friends and supporters. The Royal Academy Exhibition, with its eclectic display of subject and styles in huge and visually confusing numbers, is representative of an outdated alternative to specialisation. Yet even in the Royal Academy the group identification of the Pre-Raphaelites had the advantage of attracting critical notice. But, ultimately, it is those members of the group who rely heavily on new alternatives to the Royal Academy who gain most in terms of identification with the developing professional ideal. These alternatives include not only the Pre-Raphaelite Exhibition of 1857 but also the formation of the Hogarth Club, which also served an important professional function: it established a link between the original Pre-Raphaelites and a new generation of artists, and so helped to impose structural continuity within the Pre-Raphaelite movement. The Pre-Raphaelite exhibition of 1857 constituted an important departure in the way in which modern artists approached the presentation and promotion of their work. In this context, two questions are

worth asking. What were the advantages to the artist of such group identification? and did those advantages transcend the merely commercial?

The development of the various artistic practices that are usually described under the style label of Pre-Raphaelitism were supported by the emergence of a number of alternative professional strategies. These artistic practices included attempts to influence directly the critical debate surrounding Pre-Raphaelitism, the growing incidence of the university-educated artist, and, importantly, the growth of an uninstitutionalised, but none the less specialist, grouping of professional artists and critics, offering mutual support, encouragement and advice. Although the actual works of art produced by individual artists are diverse in appearance and intention, the response of the art establishment and the periodical press served to unite the group not only stylistically, but also for means of communal defence against hostile critics. I have already explored the idea that the opposition of the art establishment and an emerging ideology of what constituted middle-class male professionalism resulted in changes in the way the profession, and the professional identity, of the artist was secured. Because of the nature of Pre-Raphaelite anti-establishment activity it would not be unreasonable to describe the sum of changes and alternative practices as playing a significant part in the development of the idea of an avant-garde. Although the Pre-Raphaelites were apparently reacting against a preceding style, they had nevertheless achieved the cultural awareness that, in Peter Bürger's view, constitutes the characteristic insight of the avant-garde. While Bürger refers specifically to bourgeois institutions as constituting the target of avant-garde revolt, and he would probably categorise the Pre-Raphaelites as bourgeois group in terms of their class awareness, the terms of his own analysis would tend to

contradict this. Bürger's insight identifies the rebellion of the avant-garde to be not one of style but one which opposes the organs of transmission, the galleries and the periodicals, the 'institutionalised discourse about art'.³ These criteria are clearly met by the Pre-Raphaelites.

While the term 'avant-garde' was not widely used during the rise and proliferation of Pre-Raphaelitism (in fact, it was not in general critical use in Britain until around 1910), the wish to occupy ground as the representatives of the modern British School was certainly a conscious consideration in the minds of both artists and critics. Clearly the idea of an avant-garde can be thought to exist, as at least a potentiality, within the nineteenth-century belief in modern progress. While that belief centred on a material progress – which is usually expressed in terms of science, economics and society – it came to be constructed in cultural terms through the development of an experimental and progressive art. While this was manifest in the Pre-Raphaelites' attempts to represent what had previously been unrepresented, for instance the full light of day in The Hireling Shepherd (1851) and Pretty Baa-Lambs (1852), it was in their approach to the various institutions of art, the galleries, exhibitions and academies, that the Pre-Raphaelites were truly progressive. The ideological basis for much avant-garde art is that it professes opposition to what is identified as the dominant, and essentially Philistine, culture of capitalism and the bourgeoisie. It is the institutions which form the art establishment that represent the fortress to which the avant-garde must lay siege. Pre-Raphaelite skirmishes are fought within the context of critical reviews and provincial halls, and if won, the ideological walls of the established institutions are undermined – although not necessarily

breached. Their rebellion, although couched in the terms of aesthetics, lay in how they believed the profession of the artist might be pursued.

The ideological institutions that the PRB opposed, most notably the Royal Academy, were in general products of eighteenth-century thought on art. But although Pre-Raphaelitism is clearly allied to the rise of middle-class hegemony, it was not long before progressive artists, along with others in the educated middle class, began to question the foundations of the middle-class ideology that they had helped to form. As intellectuals came to doubt the efficacy of unregulated commercialism, they sought to replace their own ideal for that of the entrepreneurs. While the Royal Academy initially came under attack because it interfered with free trade, its ultimate lack of influence was largely owing to the Academy's inability to adjust to the requirements of professional specialisation.

The development of the single artist exhibition is perhaps the most extreme manifestation of the professional artist's specialisation. The one-man exhibition emerged from the practice of exhibiting the single valued work but can be seen as promising much greater professional potency in the context of Ford Madox Brown's 1865 exhibition. In the way in which as a group and as individuals they exhibited and involved themselves in current artistic debates the Pre-Raphaelites were involved in a rebellion that was very much concerned with the institutions that set the limit on what Bürger calls, the 'discourse about art'. Pre-Raphaelitism was manifestly progressive or avant-garde in the ways in which it placed itself before its public and the manner in which individual works were sold. The efficiency of these various approaches will be gauged by examining the critical response from a number of sources. At the same time it is important to be aware that the practice of art criticism too was responding to similar ideological and

economic pressures. One of the most successful aspects of the debate around Pre-Raphaelitism was the symbiosis of critical and artistic production. Not only was there an identifiable Pre-Raphaelite school of painting, but also an identifiable Pre-Raphaelite style of criticism. The knowledgeable and sympathetic support of Ruskin, W. M. Rossetti, F. G. Stephens and F. T. Palgrave—to name some of the first critics to be associated with the Pre-Raphaelites—was important in encouraging the young artists and in educating the public in the real aims of Pre-Raphaelitism. And Pre-Raphaelite critics were also in the position of being able to criticise those artists and institutions that failed to meet their stringent standards. Not surprisingly, the Royal Academy was high on this list.

II

Those critics who supported and admired the Pre-Raphaelites were not alone in attacking the Royal Academy. Criticism of the Academy was most often couched in terms of its responsibilities to education, aesthetics and the public, of growing concern to the emerging professional ideal—but it was in its identification with the monopoly economics of the eighteenth century that the Royal Academy most opposed the entrepreneurial ideal. While the Royal Academy was generally perceived as a barrier to fair and free trading, it was its inefficiency and lack of flexibility as a professional group that was to prove its greatest handicap. The Academy's practices in the protection of its members' interests seem in tune with the spirit of specialisation and professionalism. This similarity is only superficial. In its selection process and exhibiting policy, the Academy was essentially conservative, constituted as it was by members whose reputations were firmly founded in a conventional practice of art. The crowded walls of the summer exhibition offered more poor locations than good and mixed the dilettante with

the earnest professional. The Royal Academy's deficiency was that where it mattered, on the exhibition walls, it was not exclusive enough. And while the Academy could offer the exclusive honour of membership, it refused this to the majority of the Pre-Raphaelites throughout the 1850s, 1860s and the 1870s.

Although it was on the walls of the Academy that the Pre-Raphaelites first entered the professional arena, the development and larger success of the school was founded on alternative specialist exhibiting and a private commerce in art.

The same year that saw the start of the wide and intensive attack on the exhibited works of the PRB, was also significantly marked by critical views of the Royal Academy in the leading specialist art periodical. The Art-Journal's review of the eighty-second exhibition of the Royal Academy in 1850 began with a review of the Academy itself.⁴ The criticism offered was harsh: the institution was found to be deficient in its ability to adapt to the modern age. The reviewer clearly felt that although it was time for the Academy to take stock of both its function and effect, it was incapable of so doing. The members of the Academy, having 'persuaded themselves of their own infallibility, . . . have repelled all ideas of change.' But, as the reviewer noted, change was in the air whether the Academicians willed it or not. Foremost among those changes in 1850 was the imminent loss of 'the rooms they occupy, and have occupied so long, to the honour of Art'.⁵ Although the loss of the use of part of the National Gallery was to be ameliorated by a grant of money, the Art-Journal intimates that there is widespread objection to greater state aid. Henceforth, the article suggests, the Academy must support their 'schools, library, and exhibitions' from their own resources. While the Prime Minister, Lord Russell, was in favour of granting much greater support, there were apparently a large number of politicians and

others who felt that the Academy's lack of consideration, even contempt, for the public's opinion that change was necessary, absolved the public purse from further involvement. The Art-Journal believed that the Academy, contrary to the interests of British Art, had convinced themselves that 'what was good in 1768 was equally good in 1850.'

The crime of the Royal Academy, then, was that it remained a truly anachronistic institution. The function for which it had been established – to raise the standard of British Art – had, in the opinion of many, not been maintained in the face of change. While the Academy were committed to 'educating the artist in his profession, and to teaching the public to appreciate it; to fixing pictorial skill in a high social position,' this was done without taking sufficient account of the spirit of the age. Although that spirit might be described as conservative by the Art-Journal, the periodical demanded 'wholesome and practical' reforms. Such reforms had long been demanded: the Art-Journal recalls its own demands for 'renovation' in June, 1846. In 1850 the Academy seemed on the verge of being dragged into the modern age. In that year, for the first time, the press had been invited to a private view. It would appear that at last the Academy was becoming aware of its obligations to the public as well as to its membership. The Art-Journal notes that twenty-three invitations were sent to the leading metropolitan journals and, as a result, that year's reviews had 'a more generous tone.' The aristocratic preserve of the preview, which had been breached by the democratic intrusions of the journalists (whose task was to interpret the Academy for the public), excluded artists and dealers. That the Art-Journal should think this a significant reform is hardly surprising for it shows that the Academy is recognising the growing importance of the critical review. The changing role of

the professional critic, in relationship to that of the professional artist, is by this time beginning to emerge in a recognisably modern form. By 1866, for example, W. M. Rossetti is writing a review of a book of art criticism by his fellow critic F. T. Palgrave on the benefits of the 'unprofessional' art critic. By 'unprofessional' W. M. Rossetti means, rather confusingly, the critic who is not a professional artist but who earns his living by his writing.⁶ Modern critics required the time, space and ease of viewing that the private view allowed.

This important alteration in the conditions under which the critic worked should produce a review that, in the words of the Art-Journal, 'instead of [reaching] hasty conclusions, and opinions framed in anger, [achieved] results arising out of cool and considerate scrutiny.' It is interesting to note, then, that this Royal Academy exhibition marks the beginning of the attacks on the works of the PRB on show there. And of those Brothers showing that year, one was singled out for the most savage criticism. The Royal Academy and Pre-Raphaelitism are inextricably linked in the career of that particular artist, John Everett Millais, President of the Royal Academy. The only member of the original Brotherhood to be elected to the Academy, Millais is seen as one whose increasingly commercial work is supported by an ever more irrelevant establishment institution. This is an interpretation of events influenced by the later successes of Rossetti and the Aesthetic movement. In the 1850s Millais was the recipient of much of the adverse criticism in the press and yet he continued to exhibit in what he perceived as a hostile Academy. Millais's repeated submissions to the RA are in contrast to Rossetti's retreat from public exhibition and notices. As late as 1870 Rossetti wrote of an article on his poetry in the Saturday Review declaring that, although the review was bestial and incompetent, it was 'not hurtful'—a feature, he went on to

add, 'which one soon learns, in the sty of British Criticism, to be the only point worth considering'.⁷ His sensitivity to criticism tended to keep Rossetti's work from the eyes of any but the most sympathetic viewers, and even the observations of friends were sometimes resented. It is apparent that a successful, but less public, career might have been open to Millais, yet he remained fixed on the traditional method of artistic advancement. Central to the difference in their approaches was the respective professional development of Millais and Rossetti at the beginning of the 1850s. While Millais was technically the most proficient painter of his generation, Rossetti was, and felt, only partly trained. Millais had been awarded all the prizes that the Royal Academy had in its gift for its pupils. In his adult professional life Millais clearly expected to continue on that glittering path.

It was Millais's paintings that were the first to become truly popular, initially in the form of A Huguenot Refusing the Catholic Badge in 1852 (Plate 9).⁸ Either in spite of this popularity, or because of it, Millais still found himself the target of vitriolic press criticism and prejudice from within the Academy. Yet he continued to submit paintings for exhibition at the Academy and offer himself for election. In a biography of his father, John Guille Millais writes:

Gambart and other dealers, knowing that his pictures were always in request, had already made him tempting offers to exhibit solely with them, and from the commercial point of view it might have been to his advantage to do so; but he steadily refused to entertain the idea so long as any doubt remained as to the attitude of the Academy.⁹

The explanation, according to his son, is that Millais felt that the championship of Pre-Raphaelite principles, by 1854, depended solely on him. With Hunt off to the

East and Rossetti away on 'his own exclusive line,' Millais felt that should he cease to exhibit at the Royal Academy people might think him afraid of the struggle. When The Rescue was being hung for the RA exhibition of 1855 Millais took pains to see that this was done as advantageously as possible. Millais said he 'forgot all restraint and shook my fist' in the faces of the hangers.¹⁰ While the Academicians might have felt that they could not refuse Millais's pictures because of his growing popularity, they did not have to give them pride of place. By 1855 Pre-Raphaelitism seemed 'largely in the hands of Millais' and a growing group of followers including Henry Alexander Bowler, John Brett, Arthur Hughes and John William Inchbold.¹¹

Millais was successful in his election as associate to the Academy on 7 November 1853. This followed an earlier election in 1850 that had been overturned on the grounds of the artist's extreme youth. On hearing of the election Rossetti wrote to his sister Christina: 'Millais, I just hear, was last night elected an associate; so now the whole Round Table is dissolved'.¹² This response from Rossetti confirms at least his awareness of several aspects of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. The first is that, to an extent, the Brotherhood existed in opposition to the Royal Academy, that the initials ARA after the artist's name could not co-exist happily with PRB. It is also a recognition of the importance of the precociously gifted Millais to the Pre-Raphaelite enterprise. With Hunt in the Holy Land and Millais in the Academy, the PRB could no longer be considered a viable professional grouping. The allusion to the Morte d'Arthur is also very significant. While it reflects the general interest in things medieval and knightly which Rossetti shared with many middle-class young men it also suggests that he viewed Pre-Raphaelitism as a quest. The interest in medieval chivalry is also

closely allied to the development of the ideal of the altruistic professional. That Millais's choice of the Academic route was perceived by Rossetti as one that separated Millais from the 'round table' is an important development. Rossetti clearly identified the group as having a purpose and he continued to forge and maintain links with sympathetic artists and writers throughout his career. Millais, on the other hand, chose to embrace the dusty honours of the Royal Academy. This decision was not one forced on him by economic necessity: alternatives to the Academy, like Gambart's offer, were already evident. Millais's success and popularity were, anyway, much more a result of a new entrepreneurial market in art than they were of any influence that the Royal Academy had.

In the forefront of the opportunities that were developing for the Brotherhood were those offered in the new industrial cities. The merchants and industrialists may have perceived in Pre-Raphaelitism a school of painting in which they could identify their class and cultural interests. Led by the moral aesthetic of Ruskin the advanced fraction of the middle classes perhaps began to associate Pre-Raphaelite painting with a progressive, but respectable, social awareness. In the provinces an interest in Pre-Raphaelitism was often manifest in direct action. Millais, in a letter to Thomas Combe in 1852, demonstrates his caution in the face of their approaches:

It is quite a 'lark' now to see the amiable letters I have from Liverpool and Birmingham merchants, requesting me to paint them pictures, any size, subject, and amount I like—leaving it all to me. I am not likely to let them have anything, as they would probably hawk it about until they obtained a profit.¹³

Millais clearly mistrusts, at this stage, the imperatives of the mercantile class and their intentions as far as his work is concerned. We can also identify in Millais's statement the developing rift between the professional and entrepreneurial ideal. There is an element of contempt in Millais's attitude to the industrialists because they do not share the aesthetic taste of the artist nor can they be expected to act from anything except the profit motive. Yet, like the other Brethren and those associated with Pre-Raphaelitism, he is not above exploring the provincial path to fame and fortune. However, this path was not as rosy as it appears from Millais's letter. In a forthcoming essay, Stephen Wildman of Birmingham City Art Gallery cannot identify a single Birmingham art collector who can match the progressive enthusiasm of Thomas Plint of Leeds or James Leathart of Newcastle.¹⁴ It is possible that Millais's 'Birmingham merchant' is generic rather than specifically of that place. Perhaps disappointed because of Millais's snobbery, they avoided other Pre-Raphaelite offerings. Whatever the cause, Wildman is unable to establish a Birmingham purchaser of Pre-Raphaelite art before the 1870s, by which time the school was well-established.

Yet it remains the case that the developing fraternity of art dealers clearly found in the Pre-Raphaelites, and certainly in Millais, a commodity that could be promoted in a more active way than had been possible in the past. In marketing Pre-Raphaelite prints dealers like Gambart were acting partly in response to their own entrepreneurial inclinations but also to service an increasing interest shown in provincial and industrial cities in Pre-Raphaelite painting. The requests that Millais cites above are one manifestation of that interest, and dealers were not slow to promote the new school in areas that as yet were not actively seeking the works of the young artists. In March of 1852 Millais wrote to Thomas Combe that

the dealer 'Farrer has sent the picture of "Mariana" to Edinburgh, to gratify the Caledonian curiosity, those people having expressed a wish to see some of the Pre-Raphaelite pictures'.¹⁵ The interest of the dealers in the success of the Pre-Raphaelites was of course largely commercial and was based more on the lucrative, and growing, market for engravings than on the sale of paintings to art collectors.

The willingness of the dealers to present the works of individual artists before an interested and growing public demonstrates a tendency that was to lessen the importance of the Royal Academy. Gambart and Farrer, however, represent a decidedly entrepreneurial opposition to the Academy and while their activities support the development of Pre-Raphaelitism, Rossetti and Brown, for example, reluctantly dealt with them only when absolutely necessary. The instincts of the dealers in promoting new artists through exhibition were, however, sound. This was especially the case as much of this growing market was in the Midland and Northern cities that were remote from the annual Academy exhibition, if not from the press criticism of it. Provincial criticism, when prompted by local exhibition, tended to reflect that of the London periodical press. Thus the Birmingham Journal echoed Ruskin's praise and critical evaluation of the Pre-Raphaelites and promoted the conversion of the middle classes to Pre-Raphaelite principles, stating that 'many who came to scoff' remained 'to wonder and admire'.¹⁶ Dealers like Gambart and Farrer astutely fed provincial inquisitiveness by showing controversial Pre-Raphaelite paintings around the country. Gambart's approach was characterised by the promotion of art that he believed in to exploit a booming Victorian art market. The willingness of dealers to speculate on the careers of young artists was one that was essential

to the emergence of the new professionalism. Once the boom had faded, and the taint of commercialism was not so strong around the dealers, they would be able to play a fuller role in the realisation of the professional ideal. But it was not only the dealers who were actively undermining the hold of the Capital and the Royal Academy. Groups of artists and connoisseurs in the provincial cities were themselves becoming actively involved in exhibiting art, and the Pre-Raphaelites responded positively to growing interest in their work by sending it to such exhibitions.

Although Millais's response to the overtures of the merchants for his work was cautious, he did not hesitate to place his work before those same merchants. In 1852 Millais wrote, 'I expect soon to have an invitation to a banquet at Birmingham in honour of the success of their exhibition, to which I sent Ophelia'.¹⁷ The exhibition was the Birmingham Society of Artists' Autumn exhibition. The Society had been holding such exhibitions since 1842 and in 1849 had exhibited Ford Madox Brown's Wycliffe. But Millais's was the first Pre-Raphaelite exhibit that the Society had solicited – although, in fact, it was his Dove Returning to the Ark that they had requested, early in 1851, following its exhibition at the Royal Academy.¹⁸ The Dove had been one of the paintings that had, after being severely criticised in the Times, prompted Ruskin's letter to that newspaper on 13 May 1851 in defence of the Pre-Raphaelites. W. M. Rossetti recorded the Birmingham request for the painting in his entry in the PRB Journal for the 13–15 May 1851. There can be little doubt that it was the controversy surrounding Pre-Raphaelitism that made it of interest to Birmingham, and the emergence of Ruskin on the side of the young artists could only have added to that interest. The curiosity of the Birmingham Society of Artists was not inspired

by the enthusiasm of a John Miller or a William Lindsay Windus, as was that of the Liverpool Institute. Nevertheless, the success of Pre-Raphaelite artists in Liverpool, Holman Hunt's Valentine Rescuing Sylvia from Proteus had won the £50 there in November 1851, encouraged Millais to send Ophelia to Birmingham in 1852. Like the Liverpool Institute the Birmingham exhibition awarded a prize. Millais lost this by a few votes, the prize being awarded to Edward Matthew Ward's Charlotte Corday Going to Execution. The losing artist was invited to the commemorative dinner, as compensation for not winning the prize perhaps. That Birmingham staged such exhibitions and accompanying banquets would seem to demonstrate the importance with which the commercial middle class was beginning to imbue art. Yet, as appeared to be the case in Liverpool, Pre-Raphaelitism seems to have been the enthusiasm of a minority of vocal artists and critics. One such was the art critic for the Birmingham Journal, who wrote of Holman Hunt's Strayed Sheep, which was exhibited in the 1853 Birmingham exhibition, that it was one 'of the most perfect works in the exhibition, and one that ought to be studied not for mere mechanical imitation, but with an intelligent appreciation of its peculiar beauties and its special teaching'.¹⁹ Such limited enthusiasm was nevertheless sufficient to encourage a small but growing group of collectors to buy Pre-Raphaelite paintings. In addition, the growing fame of the Pre-Raphaelites was helping to create a potential market for the fine art prints of their work that were soon to be produced.

In spite of the apparent provincial success of Pre-Raphaelitism, Millais continued to persevere with his uneasy relationship with the Academy. Even after his election as Associate he continued to 'enjoy' a disputatious involvement with the membership. The Academy exhibition of 1856 was the cause of a number of

distraught letters to Effie, his wife, on the behaviour of the Academicians. On 2 May 1856, he writes:

Every day I meet with the Academicians I perceive new horrors. So determined are they to insult every man who chooses to purchase my works, that this year they have done the same with Miller [John Miller buyer of Peace Concluded] as they did with [Joseph] Arden, when he bought the Order of Release. For the first time they have not sent him an invitation to the dinner, at which he smiles, knowing the reason.²⁰

Perhaps Millais maintained his determination to wrest full honours from the Academy because of this prolonged wrangling.

During that May in 1856 Millais seemed to be restating, in strong terms, the opposition of the original Brotherhood to the very nature of the Royal Academy. At times he appeared to be moving towards an ultimate rejection of the Academy's ability to evaluate either his or any other artist's work:

I never saw anything more shameless than the treatment by the Royal Academy of my work. Every year it is the same. The surest sign of a young man's work being worthless is generosity and applause from the Academy!²¹

This belief in the value of his own work is, of course, maintained by sympathisers and by growing public success. And by a conviction that those opposed to him are acting from base motives:

There is some underhand trickery which must sooner or later come to light. I am not at all sure that it does not spring from the Academy itself; indeed, there is every reason to suppose it does. The envy and this determined cabal against me make me long to return home.²²

The most trying aspect, as far as the artist was concerned, of the objections to Millais's paintings was the nature of the press criticism of them. The Times was particularly identified with the continuing vilification of both Millais and Pre-Raphaelitism, in both correspondence and reviews. The editorial nature of such reviews highlights a particular weakness in the system of art criticism at the time, the usual anonymity of the journal's reviewers and the likelihood that they would be professional artists rather than professional critics. On this subject Millais writes:

I have found out the name of the Times' critic. It is F — — —, an artist. I don't, indeed, expect any better treatment from the Press in my lifetime, as the critics are too intimately mixed up with the profession.²³

While it was of course essential that reviewers had a good understanding of the professional practices of the artist it was perhaps not beneficial that they might have particular professional axes to grind. But this situation was changing and a new kind of criticism was emerging.

In 1855 Ruskin began publishing his notes of the Royal Academy exhibition. These Academy Notes were to be published under his own name, contrary to the current practice. Ruskin made the following statement as to the nature and intentions of his criticism:

Whatever may be their abstract truth, the following remarks have at least in them the virtue of entire impartiality. Among the painters whose works are spoken of, the greater number are absolutely unknown to me; some are my friends; and some are quite other than friends. But the reader would be strangely deceived who, from the tone

of the criticism, should endeavour to guess to which class the painter belonged.²⁴

This attitude places the critic on a new professional footing, one associated not with the advancement of friends and clients but with a socially responsible reportage of the views of an identifiable individual. While such a practice does not guarantee the infallibility of the reviewer it does ensure that he or she can be called upon to justify their observations. Thus Ruskin was easily and thoroughly identified with his support of Pre-Raphaelitism and Pre-Raphaelite artists.

In 1855 and 1856 Ruskin was still extolling Millais as the most gifted of the Pre-Raphaelite Brethren. And it is perhaps here that we might find one of the dominating reasons for that artist's continuing difficulties with certain Academicians and critics. The positive promotion of Pre-Raphaelite ideas and practices by Ruskin was necessarily critical of conventional artists and their work. Those artists who had access to the columns of the periodicals had the opportunity to refute the ideas of Ruskin by attacking the work of Millais. In the last years of the 1850s Ruskin abandons Millais on the grounds that the artist is betraying Pre-Raphaelitism in careless work. Thereafter Millais gains acceptance by fellow Academicians, and he is subsequently rehabilitated by the jobbing critics. Whether this change comes because Millais's work is no longer identifiably Pre-Raphaelite, or because he is no longer associated with the attacks on conventional art by Ruskin, there is no way of telling.

Pre-Raphaelitism, then, fares poorly in the established institutions of art. It is in the emergent practices of professional critics and the specialised and progressive groups of artists that the PRB establishes its national reputation. Millais alone perseveres with a suspect Royal Academy, only succeeding with the

Academy and the public when he loses the sympathetic attention and support of Ruskin. While Millais's election to the Royal Academy was in question, he was among the most concerned of the Brethren to hold a PRB exhibition. In an undated letter that seems to originate in either late 1852 or early in 1853, W. M. Rossetti wrote to F. G. Stephens, that, at a meeting of the Brothers, Millais had reopened the 'vexed question of setting up a PRB exhibition'.²⁵ In the event, Millais's subsequent election seems to have tempered his enthusiasm and such an exhibition was not organised until 1857. In the next section I will be considering the emergence of specialist Pre-Raphaelite exhibitions, in which Millais's influence and participation have become marginal.

III

The most common form of the artist organised exhibition was the famous display of the prized 'single work'. This appears to have been largely pioneered by Benjamin Haydon, the History painter whose tragi-comic failures led to his suicide in 1846. Haydon's difficulty in finding patronage for his ambitious (and faintly ridiculous) paintings caused him to try exhibiting them away from the Royal Academy in single work exhibitions. This promotional method was one exploited by Gambart in the late 1840s and all through the 1850s as it was ideally suited to the growing trade in fine art engravings.²⁶ Increasingly it was the dealers who were organising exhibitions, especially in the provinces. The public's opportunity to see modern art exhibited was expanding rapidly: to see and to buy. Jeremy Maas writes:

Furious arguments were carried on in the Press as to whether patrons should buy directly from the artists, from the dealers, from the auction rooms, or from the many exhibitions.²⁷

In 1848 the readers of the March Art-Union were exhorted to 'avoid the Auction-rooms and the Dealers, and visit the Exhibitions'.²⁸ Such advice in the periodical press perhaps explains the growing tendency to mount exhibitions. Certainly the Art-Union's commentator reflected a distrust of the new commercial element that the dealers represented which was shared by the artists themselves. Ernest Gambart, a Belgian dealer in fine art prints who became one of England's foremost art dealers, was the victim of one of Rossetti's delightfully malicious poems:

There is an old he-wolf named Gambart;

Beware of him if thou a lamb art.

Else thy tail and thy toes

And thy innocent nose

Will be ground by the grinders of Gambart.²⁹

Gambart's rise to eminence is almost exactly contemporary with the rise of Pre-Raphaelitism, his involvement with investment in original works of art apparently commencing in 1848. Rossetti, as well as Millais and Hunt, had little choice but to embrace the dealer's innovations during their early years.

It is perhaps the early involvement of the new breed of dealer in the fortunes of the PRB which accounts for the reluctance of the painters to organise an exhibition, solely of Pre-Raphaelite paintings, before 1857. In the early 1850s, Millais, Holman Hunt and Rossetti must have felt that further identification of the Brotherhood could only lead to intensified vilification in the Press. That such publicity could be of benefit to the artist was an idea foreign to the Victorian painter whose values were dominated by both the Royal Academy and a belief in the sovereign power of public opinion. Yet it was surely the case that exposure in

the periodicals and subsequent notoriety was responsible for the original interest of the likes of Gambart and Ferrar in the Pre-Raphaelites. The Brotherhood had emerged as the commercial world that the artist inhabited was in the throws of dramatic change. The dealers represented a new entrepreneurial efficiency and specialisation of which Gambart was the most outstanding exponent. The traditional dealer had traded in paintings and prints as a sideline to his or her primary trade as colourman or stationer. Gambart began as a seller of continental prints to the trade and expanded into speculation in modern paintings around 1848. The original Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood were the beneficiaries of a profession in the process of change, finding dealers like Gambart willing to exploit their notoriety and a critic like Ruskin willing to promote it. In fact the new professionalism of later Pre-Raphaelitism depended, to an extent, on their apparent independence of the critical and commercial spheres.

As Perkin has pointed out, the primary middle-class ideological position that gained ascendancy from the 1840s was that of the entrepreneurial fraction. While the activities of Gambart and Ferrar in promoting Pre-Raphaelitism can easily be aligned to the entrepreneurial ideal, Ruskin promotes Pre-Raphaelitism for reasons much more closely associated with the professional ideal. Ruskin continues to offer support and advice, not for financial gain, but in the interests of an apparently altruistic desire to improve British art. Neither did Ruskin's interest end with Millais, Hunt and Rossetti. By 1856 a second wave of painters influenced by Pre-Raphaelitism, or who were at least stylistically associated with it, still had reputations to make. These included young and as yet unknown and unexhibited would-be artists like Burne-Jones and Morris as well as the unfortunate Ford Madox Brown. Brown, while clearly a precursor of Pre-Raphaelitism had, either

from his own caution or that of his younger friends, failed to become associated with the leadership of the PRB. While he was not subjected to the same journalistic spite as Millais, Hunt and Rossetti, neither did Brown enjoy the attendant fame. Younger painters like Burne-Jones and Spencer Stanhope were, of course, of little interest to the commercial dealers. A largely university-educated group, the second generation were anyway approaching the profession of artist in a new light fostered by the emerging professional ideal.

It is not surprising, then, that the initiative for the formation of the Hogarth Club, probably in March of 1858,³⁰ and its subsequent, although small, exhibitions came from this younger element with the support of older but less well-known artists like Brown. The club had a brief life, and seems not to have fulfilled the expectations of its founders, Edward Burne-Jones and Spencer Stanhope. Burne-Jones's wife Georgiana relates how Burne-Jones:

described his dismay on gradually finding that it involved rules and official meetings and the passing of resolutions, all of which was so opposite of what he meant. . . 'Stanhope and I [Edward] thought it would be nice to have a club where we could chatter.' . . The club died a natural death.³¹

The Club folded (technically on Lady Day, 25 March 1862, when the lease terminated) apparently from the lack of anyone willing to take on the responsibility of organising exhibitions. The fateful vote took place on the 20 September 1861 and W. M. Rossetti records in his diary: 'On the 20th a meeting at the Hogarth, which resolved against the shilling Exhibition, and against the continuance of the Club'.³² The shilling exhibition would, of course, have been a public exhibition, replacing what had been until then nominally private

exhibitions. The great advantage of a private exhibition was that it did not prevent works from later being submitted to the Royal Academy. The Academy helped to maintain its strong position by not accepting works for its annual exhibition if they had previously been shown in public. By this time the Club's management had passed from the hands of the inexperienced Burne-Jones and Spencer Stanhope into those of the Brethren who seemed destined always to administer Pre-Raphaelitism in the wings, F. G. Stephens and W. M. Rossetti. A letter from Stephens to W. M. Rossetti pre-dates the latter's diary entry:

Martineau's [the Treasurer of the Hogarth Club] statement respecting the financial position of the Club seems to me conclusive that we cannot possibly continue in Waterloo Place beyond Lady Day next—unless indeed the members remaining consent to a considerably increased subscription, a thing not to be thought of, I opine. The number of members retiring on Lady Day is considerable.³³

It is clear that the founders and a good many of the subsequent members failed to appreciate the potential that the club offered. Burne-Jones's conception of the club and the subsequent unwillingness of members to involve it in serious exhibiting are suggestive of dilettantism and seem contrary to a spirit of modern professionalism. In fact such considerations are irrelevant. The importance of the Club is that it identified the Pre-Raphaelites as a 'specialised' professional grouping. This identification was to grow increasingly more important as the professional ideal developed.

The Club's ephemeral quality, and its officers' and members' apparent disillusionment, should not detract from the significance of the Club's foundation. It certainly had personal importance to Burne-Jones as in 'later years Edward

Referred to it [the Hogarth Club] as his "first experience of public life".³⁴ Not only the young and unknown, however, saw benefits in the Club and its exhibitions. One of the most active members in the early days of the Club was Rossetti. A letter to Ford Madox Brown shows his level of involvement in the first exhibition of the club:

The first thing to catch the eye now, since the laborious removal of Morten, are 3 staring shop Puseyisms by B., the largest figure pieces in the place. The rest of the exhibition will consist of very second rate landscapes by A. Hunt &c. Jones' drawings look splendid, but it seems they mean to hang his glass cartoons in the passage, which indeed seems necessary as they kill everything absolutely.³⁵

Thomas Morten was a young painter who had sent a picture that was not generally liked although W. M. Rossetti could see no particular objection to it, and Morten had been persuaded to remove it. Some years later W. M. Rossetti asked Stephens if he had seen that the 'unfortunate young man Morten, who used to be such a thorn in the side of the Hogarth Club, has committed suicide by hanging?' and then went on to comment that it was 'a pity, for he had plenty of talent'.³⁶ The 'Puseyisms by B.' continue the associations of Pre-Raphaelitism with the Oxford Movement, Pusey being one of the movement's foremost proselytisers. However, the identity of 'B.' is not clear and so it is impossible to identify the paintings referred to (see appendix B for the 1859 membership of the Hogarth club). Alfred Hunt was a painter of watercolours, usually highly detailed work from hedgerows, for which reason he was sometimes known as 'Birdsnest' Hunt. The Hogarth Club was not, however, the first manifestation of a wider association of Pre-Raphaelite painters following the decline of the PRB. The Pre-Raphaelite

exhibition of the previous year, which was a forerunner of the club, performed an important professional function in linking the PRB with the next generation.³⁷

I will look at the structure and nature of the exhibition shortly, but I would first like to examine the importance of it and the Club in establishing a structural continuity on the Pre-Raphaelite movement. Such identification is important because it confirms the existence of a specialisation that is clearly Pre-Raphaelite. Not only did the Pre-Raphaelite exhibition link the emerging talents of younger painters to the established reputations of Holman Hunt, Millais and Rossetti, but the later exhibitions of the Hogarth Club pulled in disciples to these newer prophets:

Younger men now [i.e. in 1863] began to frequent the studio, some of them students of the Royal Academy, whose interest and curiosity had been aroused by Edward's work at the Exhibition of the Hogarth Club: they were brought in the first instance, I believe, by Simeon Solomon, for whose gifts Edward had a sincere admiration.³⁸

Solomon was a member of an artistic family, his sister Rebecca and his elder brother Abraham were also artists. His early work included many religious subjects, mostly depicting Jewish ritual. On 11 February 1873 Solomon was arrested for gross indecency and was subsequently shunned by his friends, including Swinburne. However, until that time he was popular as a talented member of the younger group of Pre-Raphaelites. The continuity that the Hogarth club represented was not confined merely to the Pre-Raphaelites, but extended to the foundations of the modern English school even in its name.

The Hogarth Club was named after an eighteenth-century painter who could be perceived as the antithesis of the reviled Reynolds and as pointing

towards the new professionalism that the Pre-Raphaelites espoused. William Hogarth approached his profession in a radical middle-class spirit. His enthusiasm for anti-aristocratic subjects, like the satirical Marriage à la Mode (1743–5), and his deployment of the engraving to create a middle-class market for his work are forerunners of the entrepreneurial spirit that was expanding the Victorian art market. Hogarth opposed the formation of the Royal Academy preferring the small specialised group to promote higher standards. Although clearly entrepreneurial in spirit Hogarth was a prophet of the new professional ideal in his social concern and interest in the role of the artist in society. W. M. Rossetti wrote:

If we go back to the beginning of our English school, we shall find a model of the vital modern art ready to our hands. Our great Hogarth led the van of all modern-life art worthy of the name.³⁹

We may take W. M. Rossetti as the writer most likely to describe Pre-Raphaelite thoughts and ideas. Almost from its conception he had served as secretary and chronicler for the Brotherhood and had struggled to put their ideas on art into words. It is interesting to note that ideas of a 'van' are emerging in conjunction with discussions on modern art. That which is modern in Hogarth and in the Pre-Raphaelites, is similar to that for which Baudelaire calls. When W. M. Rossetti writes that it is 'art which deals with his own day [that] is especially that which the painter is qualified and called upon to execute,' he echoes some of the sentiments of the French critic.⁴⁰ By the time that London played host to an exhibition of international art in 1862, W. M. Rossetti was prepared to go as far as to say, 'England and Hogarth must have the lasting fame of initiating modern art'.⁴¹ Hogarth was a popular and important painter admired by the

traditionalists as well as those with advanced ideas. It is significant I think, that Pilkington's General Dictionary of Painters of 1840 gives Hogarth only slightly less space than Raphael and more than Reynolds.⁴² Hogarth was generally considered to be the founder of the British School and very much responsible for what was seen as the distinctive nature of British art. French critics too saw Hogarth as occupying this significant position in relationship to modern genre painting as is evidenced in Théophile Gautier's review of British Art produced in response to the international exhibition of 1862 in London.⁴³

Hogarth appealed to the Pre-Raphaelites for two reasons. He represented a new, vigorous, and identifiably English, interest in representing his own world; and he had vociferously opposed the formation of the Royal Academy. Hogarth had appeared when:

Italy, Spain, Flanders, and Germany, were comatose in art, and France had come to her Watteau, Pater, and Lancret, and was coming to her Greuze—all men of an essentially decadent period, great as was the individual merit of Watteau,—when Hogarth introduced in painting the new and important element of Brains.⁴⁴

The 'Brains' that Hogarth introduced into painting was that literary iconography so beloved by the Pre-Raphaelites. Hogarth pioneered a method of providing painting with the potential for moral discussion previously only possible in literature. It enabled the artist to pursue in a painting of the modern world the kind of literary discussion to which conventional painting only referred. Hogarth used representations of History painting in his work in the same way that the essayist used classical texts, as references to explicate his thesis. W. M. Rossetti writes:

It is not an exaggeration to say that the kind of intellect evinced by Hogarth . . . was a new thing in art, and was both the germ and the epitome of whatever is most vital in the modern as distinguished from the elder schools.⁴⁵

For W. M. Rossetti and the Pre-Raphaelites, Hogarth represented a distinct break with the conventions of European academic art.

Hogarth had the distinction not only of establishing a British school that could bear comparison with its continental countertypes, but one whose distinctive national characteristics they claimed as the prototype for their own art. To those critics who might suggest that Hogarth's moral tales would have been more clearly and more effectively expressed in writing, that in effect Hogarth's innovations were literary rather than painterly in nature, W. M. Rossetti answered:

To the argument that the art, and not the intellect of any other order, is really the supreme thing for the artist, we should be the last to demur; but this also, being a collateral question, need not detain us, and does not invalidate the position that we claim for Hogarth as the founder of modern art.⁴⁶

It was not only national pride, however, that predisposed the Pre-Raphaelites to Hogarth but also shared ideas on the proper pursuit of the artist's profession.

In Hogarth's opinion, a Royal Academy was not the most appropriate institution for the propagation of a vigorous professional art. While such foundations might have been suitable for others, they were not for the British. In the Anecdotes, edited and published in 1833, Hogarth described the intended Royal Academy as having a 'foppish kind of splendour' typical of 'these Italian

and Gallic theatres of art.' Hogarth was saved from witnessing such an unnatural child of the National genius, since he died in 1764—four years before the RA finally received its Royal Charter. But it was not only in his opposition of the Academy that his ideas were sympathetic to the Brethren and their followers. Hogarth had also developed views on art education and practice that was reflected in their own.

Hogarth's art education was conventional: he experienced what was repeated in the Academy schools a century after. He wrote of it: 'I have learned, by practice, to copy with tolerable exactness in the usual way'.⁴⁷ But as he matured to mastery in his art Hogarth had rejected this method of filling the mind with conventions culled from past masters:

Instead of burthening the memory with musty rules, or tiring the eyes with copying dry and damaged pictures, I have found studying from nature the shortest and safest way of attaining knowledge in my art.⁴⁸

This rejection of convention in favour of the truer school of Nature was, of course, one that made the Pre-Raphaelites his heirs and disciples. Hogarth was responsible for two other innovations which would benefit nineteenth-century artists and which the Pre-Raphaelites had cause to be grateful for. Both innovations are closely linked to the first stage of the developing professionalism of the artist.

Middle-class English sensibility led Hogarth to lay the foundations for the modern professionalism of the nineteenth century. It was through his efforts that the first Engraving Copyright Act was passed in 1734. This act gave fourteen years' protection from copyists to an engraver who was also responsible for the original work of art from which an engraving was taken. In 1766, two years after

his death, the Act was extended to protect Hogarth's widow, Jane. The amendment of the Act extended the copyright on a work to twenty-eight years, and its protection now applied to any person making an engraving from original work, whether the engraver was responsible for the original or not.⁴⁹ It goes without saying that Hogarth's legal innovations formed the means by which the Pre-Raphaelites, and other Victorian artists, were able to share in the rewards of commercial capitalism and benefit from the entrepreneurial efforts of the likes of Gambart, without the artists themselves having to embrace commercialism. Although the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood's initial 'scientific and hard edged' professionalism seems to link their interests with the entrepreneurial ideal, the Pre-Raphaelites, with the possible exception of the later Millais, opposed the entrepreneurial values of many patrons of art and the dealers who exploited the work of artists. The Brotherhood's decision to name their club after Hogarth may be viewed as a considered response to Hogarth's own efforts to form a similar institution.

In 1735 Hogarth began the St Martin's Lane Academy. The Academy provided 'an informal association, a kind of guild of artists mutually engaged in the provision of models and studios in which to work, and a place to exhibit, . . .'⁵⁰ While Hogarth was against a pompous and Royal institution, he none the less believed that artists needed the professional support of their older colleagues. He was a man whose roots were firmly bedded in the clay of a middle class formed in the flood of puritan radicalism that rapidly flourished in the seventeenth century. This was a class that would later emerge as a powerful intellectual force in an increasingly republican eighteenth century. The St. Martin's Lane Academy was just the sort of collegiate group that Burne-Jones and Spencer Stanhope

clearly had in mind when formulating the Hogarth Club, but such an informal society no longer met the specific professional requirements of the 1850s. While the intentions of the young founders may have been modest it seems likely that the older members saw the club as a means of attacking and supplanting the Royal Academy. William Bell Scott recalled his own feelings about the Hogarth Club in his autobiography:

This club ought to have been still in existence, and under able management it should have by this time taken a place only second to the Royal Academy in professional importance, but its existence was short.⁵¹

Bell Scott was himself among those most actively in favour of the expansion of the club into public exhibiting, as a letter of 2 March 1861 to W. M. Rossetti demonstrates. In this letter he suggests that the Hogarth Club should take over the lease of the British Institution:

It appears to me reasonably likely we might get a transfer of the Institution, and become a power. Ruskin would have great influence, Hunt too: Gabriel and half-a-dozen or so are good names, and if we all put out our whole force and were not squeezed dry by reserving for the Academy, we would do some considerable and permanent good.⁵²

But the club's membership, while united against the Academy to an extent, had far less unity than even the short-lived Brotherhood itself had enjoyed. Ford Madox Brown, intimately involved in both the 1857 exhibition and the Hogarth Club, memorably describes in his diary the personal relationships of those longest associated with Pre-Raphaelitism. It is not surprising that this revealing picture

originated with Rossetti who was clearly as lacking in discretion in conversation as he was in print. Madox Brown records with relish that:

Rossetti says Ruskin is a sneak & loves him, Rossetti, because he is one too & Munro because he is one too & Hunt he half likes because he is 1/2 a sneak, but hates Woolner because he is manly & straight forward, & me because I am d[itt]o. He adored Millais because Millais was the prince of sneaks but Millais was too much so for he [Millais] sneaked away his [Ruskin's] wife & so he [Ruskin] is obliged to hate him [Millais] for too much of his [Ruskin's] favourite quality.⁵³

Millais was not a member of the Hogarth Club because, according to Bell Scott, he could not belong to an organisation of which Ruskin was a member. The Hogarth Club had identified the aims of Pre-Raphaelitism with the development of British painting. More significantly, it gave an institutionalised identity to a larger group of artists who, although Pre-Raphaelite, had not belonged to the PRB. Most importantly, the Hogarth Club continued the identification of Pre-Raphaelitism as a specialised group. However, that specialisation began with the Pre-Raphaelite exhibition of the previous year (1857). Unlike the Hogarth Club, which had been formed at the instigation of the new generation, the Pre-Raphaelite exhibition had been organised by Madox Brown with the administrative assistance of W. M. Rossetti.

IV

It is the Pre-Raphaelite exhibition of the summer of 1857 that demonstrates the growing awareness among the artists associated with the movement, of the benefits of specialisation. What becomes clear from a consideration of that exhibition, is that the rewards of specialisation do not necessarily go to those who

have gained most public recognition but rather, favours those whose production has remained private and, thus, is more closely identified as only Pre-Raphaelite. Established Pre-Raphaelites were keen to be represented, for even Millais exhibited—in spite of his commitment to the battle in the Royal Academy and his strained relationship with Ruskin. Ford Madox Brown did most of the work involved in mounting the exhibition, and on the whole he thought it unrewarding. He wrote in his diary:

Got up the collection of preRaphael [sic] works in Russell Place during the month of June. On this I have wasted at least 4 weeks. All that came on this was that Ruskins [sic] father bought the charcoal of Beauty [this is presumably Beauty before she became acquainted with the Beast] for 10 guineas.⁵⁴

Brown clearly expected some personal and professional return in exchange for his involvement in the exhibition. This was not an unreasonable view to hold, since Brown was, even at this relatively early date, experienced in mounting exhibitions. Numerically, Brown's works dominated the exhibition. He entered twelve of his own works compared with seven entered by Rossetti and four each from Hunt and Millais (see Appendix A). Yet it is clear that the exhibition proved a disappointment to Madox Brown, as his diary testifies. The exhibition itself appeared to have cost Madox Brown money. He writes:

After poor baby's death [Arthur] I was very hard up, the Russell St. [sic] Exhibition which I paid at first all out of my own pocket (£42) came back to me but slowly (and at this date (17 Jan 1858) Millais, Rossetti & and Miss Sid have never paid their shares) [a letter from D. G. Rossetti to Brown in 1857 refers to a debt of £10 for 'Russell Place'

with profound promises to pay, this is followed by periodic excuses and occasional small sums. D. G. Rossetti, Letters, vol. 1] & obliged to ask Plint for money to bury him.⁵⁵

Thomas Plint was an early collector of Pre-Raphaelite works, especially those of Rossetti and Brown. The financial difficulties that Brown encountered probably account for his unwillingness to support the idea of public exhibitions for the Hogarth Club when these were subsequently suggested.

Millais and Holman Hunt were lightly represented in this first exhibition, but this does not necessarily reflect adversely on their commitment to the project. Both artists, throughout their careers, were aware that, to an extent, their identification with Pre-Raphaelitism placed them in a significant relationship to their profession. (This belief is supported by the publication in 1899 of Millais's biography, written by his son, and, in Holman Hunt's case, the publication, in 1905, of his memoirs.) The exhibition also served to strengthen links with those artists of the Liverpool Academy whose support had been so valuable to the Pre-Raphaelites in the early 1850s. The Liverpool artists were invited to participate in the exhibition in Russell Place, indeed Mary Bennett goes as far as to describe it as a 'joint exhibition'.⁵⁶ When, in 1858, a faction within the Liverpool Academy determined to set up a rival 'Society of Arts' and their own exhibition in competition with Pre-Raphaelite sympathisers, a meeting of the London artists at Holman Hunt's house pledged support (in the form of increasing the number of works sent) for their Liverpool colleagues.⁵⁷ But, in 1857, Millais and Holman Hunt had to limit their contribution to the London exhibition because they were involved in at least three other significant exhibitions.

Given their commitment to achieve eminence in their profession, the new work of Holman Hunt and Millais was exhibited at the Royal Academy.⁵⁸ The growing significance, moreover, of Pre-Raphaelitism had made inroads into the stock of past works that they had available to exhibit. A travelling exhibition to the United States took major works currently for sale like a copy of Hunt's Light of the World (presumably Manchester City Art Gallery's smaller version that began life as the oil sketch for Keble's original and was subsequently finished in 1856).⁵⁹ This exhibition was the first of its kind sent to the United States and is evidence of the growing interest in Pre-Raphaelitism in that country. Interestingly both Brown and Gambart were involved in this enterprise. Brown writes:

All this while the American Exhibition had been going on. I was to have gone over to hang the pictures, however the scoundrel Gambart put a stop to that & all I had was the trouble of going to select the daubs.⁶⁰

Brown, like Rossetti, seemed to have little time for the ubiquitous Gambart. Indeed, Brown seems to have blamed the dealer for the failure of this exhibition, as does Virginia Surtees, the editor of his diary. Yet Gambart would appear to have acted in what can only be described as a professional and businesslike manner. The failure of the exhibition was most probably due to the current economic conditions in the United States.⁶¹ In addition to the Royal Academy and American exhibitions there was at least one more major drain on the works of the established Pre-Raphaelites.

In Manchester a major exhibition of British art, both ancient and modern, had claimed a good deal of the Pre-Raphaelite work available for loan. The exhibition, named the 'Art Treasures' exhibition, was a major provincial event,

one of some importance to the two leading Pre-Raphaelites. Madox Brown writes in his diary:

At Manchester (to give one recording line to it) all that I remember is that an old English picture with Richard II in it was the only really beautiful work of the old masters & Hunt & Millais the only fine among the new. Hunt in fact made the exhibition.⁶²

Millais contributed Autumn Leaves (1856), his major success of the Academy exhibition of the previous year. Holman Hunt made a much bigger splash, perhaps not surprisingly as he had been away in Palestine and had professional ground to make up. He showed five works, The Hireling Shepherd (1852), Valentine Rescuing Sylvia from Proteus (1851), Strayed Sheep (1852), The Awakening Conscience (1854) and Claudio and Isabella (1853). Each of these paintings dates from the period before Hunt's absence abroad. The extent of Hunt's commitment to this exhibition is an indication of the priority that he gave to it in re-establishing his reputation. To Millais it was a significant, but secondary, show-case for his current work. The Pre-Raphaelite exhibition, certainly as far as these two were concerned, had to take its place of importance after these other calls on their work.

The 1857 Pre-Raphaelite exhibition itself was held in private rooms at 4 Russell Place.⁶³ The domestic nature of the 1857 exhibition, which was far more private than public, perhaps explains the token participation of Millais and Hunt, to them it was little more than a family affair. Brown's need for money would explain his more extensive participation, indicative of the greater professional importance that this exhibition evidenced, and hence his disappointment. The younger members, as with Burne-Jones in the Hogarth Club exhibitions, gained in

terms of being perceived as members of this advanced group of artists. In spite of its private nature, the exhibition received reviews, and it was Rossetti whose reputation most benefited from this attention. While artists like Millais and Hunt, who were frequently before the public, gained little, Rossetti, whose works were rarely seen, was elevated to a position of equality with Royal Academy exhibitees. The rewards of specialisation, then, can be seen to go to those who avoid the established professional institutions, in favour of those institutions that are emerging.

The semi-private nature of the exhibition meant that reviewers could be invited who would be on the whole sympathetic to Pre-Raphaelitism. It is unlikely that Rossetti would have consented to exhibit if this had not been the case. The Saturday Review (1855-1938) begins its article by emphasising the domestic proportions of the event:

In two rooms on a first-floor of a private house, No. 4, Russell-place, Fitzroy-square, there has lately been a private exhibition of an interesting collection of paintings and drawings by the pre-Raphaelites and their followers.⁶⁴

The Saturday Review maintained strict anonymity in a belief that this ensured editorial unity. It is, I think, fair to say that the Saturday Review's general response to Pre-Raphaelitism would appear to have been balanced, if the comments by W. M. Rossetti and D. G. Rossetti are anything to go by. The two brothers complain about the Saturday Review on occasion, but not particularly violently. The Saturday Review was still a young magazine in 1857; it was first published in 1855. For this reason, the Saturday had not been involved in the early criticism of the PRB. It had been formed with the intentions of serving the

'moderate opinions of thoughtful and educated society'.⁶⁵ However, by 1866, the Saturday Review was sufficiently out of sympathy with Pre-Raphaelite ideas to savagely attack A. C. Swinburne's Poems and Ballads.

The review of the Pre-Raphaelite exhibition went on to give a clear indication of the proportions of the ever growing Pre-Raphaelite family that inhabits these rooms:

The artists whose pictures have been exhibited are, Millais, Holman Hunt, Gabriel Rossetti, Ford Madox Brown, Arthur Hughes, Charles Collins, Inchbold, John Brett, R. B. Martineau, J. Woolf, the late Thomas Seddon, William Davis, W. L. Windus [Davis and Windus were both members of the Liverpool Academy], and a few others who have yet their names to make [this would include Elizabeth Siddal].

It is this loose familial association which is the first interest of the reviewer, as is the variety of the performances of the individual members. The intimate conditions of the exhibition appear to offer insight into the Pre-Raphaelite agenda:

It was especially interesting as showing what are the real views and aims of the people calling themselves pre-Raphaelites. There could scarcely be a greater diversity of styles and natural capacities than in the score or so of artists whose works were here collected together.

The reviewer's remarks on the 'diversity of styles' are clear evidence of a contemporary awareness, at least among the cognoscenti, that the Pre-Raphaelite style label was an elastic one. At this stage in the development of the movement Burne-Jones had barely begun his career. Rossetti had himself not long commenced those obsessive portraits in oil which would stretch what was meant by Pre-Raphaelitism even further. What is important is that the reviewer has had

his awareness of a group identity strengthened while being made clearly aware of the variety of styles that the individual members of that group display. The identification of a number of differing styles and artists with one oppositional movement, and with a representational exhibition, is a significant development. While the Pre-Raphaelites represent a more formal association than earlier schools based on style and subject matter, like, for instance, the Cockney poets, it shares their freedom from prescription. The Pre-Raphaelites were a group who shared ideas and ideals that increasingly, in their rejection of modern industrialism, came to oppose and criticise the entrepreneurial ideal.

The Saturday Review's notice goes on to describe the stylistic variety of the artists in more detail:

From Seddon and John Brett, whose eyes are simple photographic lenses, to Gabriel Rossetti and Holman Hunt, who see things in 'the light that never was on sea or land,' but which is, for all that, a true and genuine light, everything, as a rule, and as far as it goes, is modest, veracious, and effective.

Notable here is the juxtaposition of the styles of Holman Hunt and Rossetti, as well as the obvious sympathy shown for the general aims of the school. Those artists whose works appear more conventional in this setting do not fare so well:

Mr Martineau's Taming of the Shrew is just one of those pictures which form the staple of every Academy Exhibition—clever, but theatrical. In this little exhibition, however, the above picture appeared as startling and as strange in its effect, by contrast with the others, as one of the most peculiar of Millais' or Hunt's does on the walls of the Academy.

Yet it is not the Academy successes of Hunt and Millais that dominate this exhibition. Rather, greater attention is paid to the far more elusive works of Rossetti.

The reviewer's comments on the nature of Rossetti's reputation are enlightening, prompted, as they are, by the significant number of works that the artist had contributed to the exhibition:

The somewhat numerous contributions of Mr. Gabriel Rossetti unquestionably constitute the main interest of the exhibition. Mr. Rossetti's name is almost as well known to the public as that of Mr. Millais or Mr. Holman Hunt; yet, strange to say, the public has never had an opportunity of looking upon his works. These are known only to the friends, or friends of the friends, of the artist; and the extent to which his name, through them, has become famous, is at least a proof that, within the circle to which he chooses, for reasons which we do not profess to be acquainted, exclusively to address himself, his influence is one of singular power.

The writer of the anonymous review—possibly F. T. Palgrave or P. G. Hamerton, both of whom were associated with the Saturday Review—is clearly sympathetic to Pre-Raphaelitism (Palgrave was an acquaintance of W. M. Rossetti, so, in view of the professed ignorance of the writer on D. G. Rossetti's circle, Hamerton may well be the likeliest candidate). At this early stage in the journal's history, the Saturday Review's editorial hands were relatively free from Pre-Raphaelite blood, which perhaps explains why the reviewer was extended an invitation to a private exhibition. Encapsulated within the reviewer's remarks on 'friends, or friends of friends' is an indication of one of the most important changes that the profession

is under-going. Even at this early date Rossetti has managed to attain a high reputation without once exhibiting at the Royal Academy. Because he enjoys the support of Ruskin, his brother W. M. Rossetti, F. G. Stephens, and that of the up-and-coming Burne-Jones and Morris, Rossetti is increasingly the focus of Pre-Raphaelitism. Taken together, the private allegiance of the 'unprofessional' critics (in W. M. Rossetti's sense) committed to the movement, and the loyalty of the new university men, ensure that Rossetti's name remains associated with the leading edge of Pre-Raphaelitism.

Work shown in major public exhibitions was now no longer the only criterion of a professional artistic reputation. In fact, Rossetti's reputation was as much a result of his failure to exhibit as it was in spite of it. Not only did the reviewer not condemn Rossetti for his lack of public exposure, but he also proceeded to excuse and explain the virtue of such behaviour:

Probably there is no other artist living who demands so much mental and moral culture for his appreciation [than Rossetti], or who appeals so little to the passive senses, by which alone ninety-nine spectators out of a hundred are won.

So Rossetti is viewed as the intellectual leader of the Pre-Raphaelite movement—beyond the understanding of the aesthetically dormant middle classes who flood the public exhibitions. Since he cannot be understood by those who lack refined sensibility and enhanced intellectual understanding, Rossetti is deemed wise not to waste his offerings as an anvil for the untutored hammer of public opinion.

The presumed inability of the public to make valid assessments of such advanced work also throws the popular professional success of Millais into a less flattering light. Millais refutes the opinions of conservative Academicians by

pointing to popular success, while Rossetti is successful in that he enjoys the benefits of an alternative professional evaluation. Of Rossetti, the author of the review goes on to say:

He neither follows nor violates nature in his colours, but employs them as a symbolic commentary on his thought. In this and in some other points he is entirely opposed to the other leading members of the pre-Raphaelite school, of which he is reputed to have been the founder.

Here Rossetti's work is seen as an example of a very different kind of success in art, that of the avant-garde artist. He is considered at once to be a founder of a school and one who is none the less opposed to it. In other words, his is a success based on private, rather than public, opinion – an opinion founded on claims by intellectual leaders presumed to have greater professional insight and sensibility. Such a positive response to the pictures that he exhibited clearly encouraged Rossetti. That is no doubt why in the following year he submitted work to the Liverpool Academy's exhibition for the first time.⁶⁶ Perhaps the praise Rossetti received in 1857 served to convince him that at least discerning strangers were capable of enjoying and understanding his work. By comparison, Millais's success, based on seemingly solid foundations of money and public approval, begins to look increasingly shaky. It is perhaps also worth noting that it was not until after Rossetti's death, in 1882, that Millais and Hunt began to contest the leadership of the Brotherhood, and Pre-Raphaelitism generally. In the 1880s Pre-Raphaelitism was gaining in influence and Rossetti was increasingly perceived as not only the most influential Pre-Raphaelite, but also as the movement's originator.

Whether Millais made a miscalculation when he 'exhibited four small portraits – one of Mr. Holman Hunt, another of Mr. Wilkie Collins, and two female heads' – remains difficult to say. Certainly, any leadership that Millais might have claimed as the most professionally successful of the Pre-Raphaelites was being undermined in the two reviews of the Pre-Raphaelite Exhibition. However, it would not have been possible for Millais to envisage the nature of those changes affecting the established reputations of the professional artist. The reviewer, looking at these portraits, accepts Millais's high reputation, but undermines his claim to equivalent status within this revolutionary group:

One of these [female heads], called the Wedding Cards, justifies the highest praises the artist has ever received as a colourist, and yet, strange to say, there is less positive colour in this picture than in any other in the room.

The reputation that Millais has achieved as a colourist would only seem to stand up to comparison with the dingy offerings at the Royal Academy. The older rival of the Saturday Review, the Athenaeum, also noticed the exhibition, and Millais's declining influence in Pre-Raphaelite circles. The Athenaeum too followed a moderate path in its criticism but, according to Alvin Sullivan, during the 1850s and 1860s, the qualities of its criticism were generally below those of the Saturday Review.⁶⁷

The Athenaeum article is interesting in that it identifies the oppositional nature of the exhibition. The writer boldly states that if the 'Academy will not do justice, they will not be shown justice'.⁶⁸ The Royal Academy, while it may not have done Millais complete justice, certainly continued to attentively hear his case. The Athenaeum further describes the original members of the Brotherhood:

Mr Millais, the chief of the sect, — Mr. H. Hunt, the apostle of the order, — and Mr. D. Rossetti, the original founder of the three lettered race, who is generally spoken of by them in a low voice, and is supposed from the fertility of his allegorical sketches to be capable of doing anything, though he does not and will not exhibit in public.

Once again, Rossetti's failure to exhibit publicly proves to be a strength rather than a weakness. The private reputation he has gained ensures that his work is given special, if not entirely sympathetic, consideration.

While the reviewer may be seduced by the potency of Rossetti's reputation and the originality of his ideas, the artist cannot fully be forgiven for not following the conventional path. He is warned that more solid evidence of worth is required. In fact, the reviewer is in no doubt that Rossetti is a poet and a thinker: '— but sketching is deceptive and dangerous. It is the day-dream of painting.' There can, however, be no doubt that this article serves the fame of Rossetti far more surely than it aids the reputation of the other established painters. By asserting that Rossetti was also the founder of the group, as did the Saturday Review, the Athenaeum also prepares the way for his leadership of the Pre-Raphaelites to be generally assumed. While Millais is given titular leadership, in recognition of his popular and Academic success, his sun has clearly set in the world of modern, progressive art. Neither does Hunt nor Brown fare much better.

Brown and Holman Hunt both receive some positive notice, yet it is marred by error, and they are left in no doubt of their relative status to Rossetti by the Athenaeum's careless reviewer. After ruminating on the genius of the reclusive poet, he writes:

Perhaps next to Mr. D. Rossetti's thoughtful sketches the most interesting was Mr. H. Hunt's 'Last Look at England,' [sic] a fine picture of departing emigrants. The mother weeping, the spendthrift shaking his fist at the rascally old place that has stripped him of everything, — a Hogarth fertility of thought pervades the picture.

While the writer shows an interesting prescience in linking both the Pre-Raphaelites and the exhibition with Hogarth, his indifference to the accuracy of the remainder of his sentence must have been a blow to both Hunt and Brown. Not only does he attribute the painting to the wrong artist, but also misnames the picture. The reviewer's lack of attention to detail tends to support Sullivan's evaluation of the quality of the Athenaeum's criticism at this time.⁶⁹ There is little excuse for the Athenaeum's errors. The Saturday Review was altogether more in touch with the pattern of Pre-Raphaelite exhibiting, and points out that:

The Last of England, by Ford Madox Brown, gained a prize at Liverpool, where it was exhibited last year; but it is new to Londoners. The subject is one of those which the pre-Raphaelites sometimes venture to tale, not as a comedy, but as a tragedy, from modern everyday life.

Unlike the two other established artists, Hunt and Millais, Brown had not only submitted the largest number of works but had placed a work in the exhibition that had already enjoyed some success in the provinces. Yet it did not earn him greater praise than the work of a complete newcomer.

In noticing the work of Elizabeth Siddal in the exhibition, the Saturday Review confirms the new professional position of Rossetti. The link between master and pupil was emphasised:

There was one lady contributor, Miss E. E. Siddal, whose name was new to us. Her drawings display an admiring adoption of all the most startling peculiarities of Mr. Rossetti's style, but they have nevertheless qualities which entitle them to high praise.

It is interesting that Lizzie Siddal's very positive debut is negated in the subsequent history of Pre-Raphaelitism. While work has now been done by feminist art historians, particularly Jan Marsh and Griselda Pollock, to reclaim Siddal as an artist this is evidence that confirms that the early critical response to her work was serious and favourable. Although Siddal was being linked subordinately to Rossetti it was not in her role as lover, muse and model—roles that were later emphasised by both Holman Hunt and W. M. Rossetti. In their testimony Siddal's talent appears either as fragile as her health or largely exaggerated by D. G. Rossetti. As Pollock says: 'Recognition of woman's active part in culture is thus eroded'.⁷⁰ In turn Rossetti's history as a pupil, first of Brown and then Holman Hunt, dissolves in these reviews and Rossetti is confirmed as the master of the new style. In 1861, near the end of the brief flowering of the Hogarth Club, W. M. Rossetti wrote:

There can be no dispute that the advance in style which the British school now presents is mainly due to the stern and true discipline of Praeraphaelitism. This has taught painters how to exhibit facts: they are now practising how to combine realised facts into pictures.⁷¹

D. G. Rossetti played only a small part in exhibiting facts, but his role was set to become larger. His brother W. M. Rossetti went on to say that current developments were 'not a superseding of Praeraphaelitism [sic], but the second and forecast stage of it—the one it contemplated and prepared.' While Brown,

Millais and Hunt had been calling in the wilderness, Hunt rather more literally than Millais and Brown, they had perhaps little realised that they were playing the Baptist's part. Yet Rossetti's fostering of mystery and personal patronage, while possibly the most successful, was not the only alternative used to circumvent the almost monopolistic power of the Royal Academy. There was also the 'manly' directness of Ford Madox Brown.

Ford Madox Brown's one-man exhibition held at 191 Piccadilly in 1865 represents a highly significant aspect to the evolution of an exhibiting strategy to suit the various needs of the modern professional artist, one that I have not so far explored. This is the one-man show. The exhibition was successful in so far as it reclaimed for Brown some of the status he had forfeited to Rossetti in 1857. If specialisation indicates the development of the professional ideal then it is clear that the one-man show, the ultimate specialisation, is an important innovation. The exhibition consisted of some one-hundred works. Of these about fifty were oil paintings and the remainder drawings and watercolours. The exhibited works represented the output of the artist from the late 1840s to his most recent major painting. Many of the pictures on show had been borrowed from private collections or had been commissioned – so the purpose of the exhibition was not exclusively to make immediate sales. Of course an exhibition generated income in terms of entrance fees but in recent years single-work exhibitions, easily transportable to the provinces, had proved more profitable. More extensive exhibitions were a rarity, and continued to be so for some time.

An exhibition like this can be seen as developing from the current practice of exhibiting and publicising the single valued work. The relationship is maintained for, while the exhibition was extensive and representative, no secret

was made of its serving as a setting for the public introduction of Brown's ambitious study Work. By placing this memorable painting in an exhibition that explored the development of the artist to that point, however, Brown was deviating from a successful model. The benefits of this innovation are not at once clear. Although the exhibition generated a degree of periodical attention, the space given to Work was necessarily reduced. The review in the Art-Journal can only spare one sentence, and this to excuse the writer from treating the painting in depth because it would 'require a chapter'.⁷² To be sure, the Athenaeum (for which F. G. Stephens was now the regular art critic) manages to give half of a fifteen-hundred-word piece to the principal picture (the other half is spent on works that have already done their part in establishing the artist's reputation).⁷³ Where, then, are the gains from such an exhibition?

Both reviews do, of course, concentrate on the work of Brown. In looking at past work they are bound to reflect on the artist's growing reputation; an artist who is, in the words of the Athenaeum, of 'original intellect and thoroughly English tendencies.' While a measured evaluation of Brown's life and work could have been only beneficial to the artist, it was unlikely to increase the prices that his paintings fetched in the same way that representation in a prestigious national or international exhibition might. However, when in June of the same year T. E. Plint's collection was sold, Work, which had been commissioned by the Leeds collector, went for £550. The painting achieved this sale when other Pre-Raphaelite works by Brett, Wallis and Hughes were fetching a fraction of their original price. In the case of Brett's Chepstow Castle £20 was paid for a painting that Plint had bought for £420.⁷⁴ The public exposure that Brown enjoyed from his exhibition enhanced his reputation but was as effective as the single-work

exhibition in identifying the current masterpiece. As the century progressed so did the tendency of the modern art trade to favour the group exhibition and the one-man show. Both strategies were in part a response to the commercial realities of selling avant-garde art but also owe something to the developing professional ideal and its tendency to encourage specialisation. An allied ingredient in the development of professionalization was undoubtedly the critic whose aim was to promote the advanced and modern in art.

On 30 March 1865 Brown wrote to W. M. Rossetti to thank him for a very favourable review in Pall Mall. Although the review was anonymous Brown had identified the author because of W. M. Rossetti's personal knowledge of the artist. Brown describes the review as a 'glorious puff'.⁷⁵ It was not the only partisan review Brown received, as he also mentions F. T. Palgrave's auspicious notice in the Saturday Review. Such anonymous puffing by friends had a long tradition and was, at least partly, a result of the practice of artists also acting as critics. The majority of such journalism was little more than orchestrated mutual back scratching. Originally the anonymity of the reviewer was intended to free the individual from the threat of libel or violence by presenting all views as those of the editor. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine (1817-1980) was typical of this combative style in its early years, attacking Leigh Hunt and the school of Cockney poets under the editorial name of Christopher North. But this style of criticism was perceived as increasingly old-fashioned. As early as the 1830s J. S. Mill's London Review (shortly to become the London and Westminster Review—1824-1914—when it merged with that earlier Benthamite organ) established a policy that every article and review must be signed, either by name, initial or pseudonym. The intention was then to divorce the editor from opinion and allow

views to be identified with an individual.⁷⁶ Yet in spite of this change in intention, anonymous reviews were still very much the rule in the 1850s, allowing writers to attack their enemies and praise themselves and their friends. Millais, as we know, made complaints about the incestuous nature of art criticism and journalism, while Ruskin, in the spirit of Mill, argued in favour of the signed review. The habit of attributing articles of criticism to their authors was slowly growing. Although both Ruskin and W. M. Rossetti had at the beginning of their careers habitually hidden their identities, as their reputations and confidence grew as critics they became more willing to be associated with the opinions that they published.

W. M. Rossetti followed his piece on Brown's exhibition in Pall Mall with a lengthy essay in May's Fraser's Magazine.⁷⁷ The latter work, unlike the Pall Mall notice, was clearly attributed to the author. While, as we might expect, the article is very favourable, it is also analytical. Of particular interest in the context of this study is W. M. Rossetti's interest in the implications of the exhibition to the professional artist. According to W. M. Rossetti, Brown's exhibition is innovative in both intention and detail. The critic saw the exhibition in Piccadilly as an important development that benefited the general public, the artist and the serious student of art. We might, incidentally, wonder whether it was an accident that this was the very street on which sat Burlington House, the new site of the Royal Academy exhibition. W. M. Rossetti noted that the practice of exhibiting the work of a single artist had been growing 'of late years.' However, this practice, had usually taken the form of 'single works, . . . chiefly since Mr Holman Hunt commenced thus displaying his Finding the Saviour in the Temple.' Hunt had exhibited this work in the German Gallery from 17 April 1860. The immense

success of this work (bought, including the copyright, by Gambart for £5,500) had clearly encouraged the growth of that particular method of display. But, as W. M. Rossetti points out, while exhibiting a single painting has advantages beyond the obvious financial benefits, in that it allowed an artist's work to be seen without the distractions of other conflicting works, there were also disadvantages.

Likening the exhibition of a single work to the publication of a single poem, W. M. Rossetti compares Brown's exhibition to a volume of poems. This practice allows the serious visitor to examine and evaluate the work of the artist. While the artist's paintings may have been seen individually in large exhibitions over the years, the single artist exhibition allows contemplation of his development and standing within his profession. The major advantage over the single work exhibition, however, is the saving in effort, time and expense. Travelling to an exhibition, paying an entrance fee and then queuing to spend a few minutes in front of one painting are not conducive to the greatest appreciation of the artist's achievement. Brown's exhibition of one hundred works shows a serious and sincere approach to his art that the writer can only applaud. Yet increased efficiency and content are not, in W. M. Rossetti's opinion, Brown's major contribution to modern exhibiting.

In conjunction with this exhibition, Brown published a descriptive catalogue. W. M. Rossetti writes that this 'is an innovation, almost without precedent, and, as we think, a very important one.' It was no mere list of titles but a catalogue that described in detail the content of the work, the ideas behind it, and an exhibiting history with dates. The writer can think of 'few greater reforms' that could improve the practice of the artist who is of 'enough importance' to be worth sincere consideration. W. M. Rossetti clearly believes that

such a catalogue marks a significant development in the relationship between the artist, the critic and the public. It was a development that pointed to a different approach, not only by the artist, but also by the critic. This difference can be interpreted as demonstrating evidence of the developing professional ideal.

Interest in the accurate evaluation of the production and function of a work of art indicates a high level of integrity in both critic and artist. That assessments of value, both aesthetic and material, should at least appear impartial, was essential to the establishment of a credible professional ideal.

To W. M. Rossetti, Brown's exhibition notes comprised a valuable document of scholarly research. He argued the usefulness of such notes to our understanding of the works of Michaelangelo, Raphael and, of course, Hogarth, had those artists thought to provide them. W. M. Rossetti's faith in the written word did, at times, seem excessive; he wrote of catalogue readers knowing 'exactly what the artist meant' in his work. However, the critic was not exaggerating his own belief that such documentation brought with it a more thorough appreciation of the way an artist is seen to work. The only other example of descriptive notes provided for an exhibition of work that W. M. Rossetti could bring to mind was that of William Blake. Blake's catalogue had lately been reprinted in Alexander Gilchrist's Life published in 1863. Gilchrist was also the author of a Life of Etty and had died in 1861. His Life of Blake, was finished by his wife Anne, a friend of W. M. Rossetti. Rossetti pointed out that Blake's catalogue was very different from Brown's being 'arbitrary, discursive, and personal.' Not, in effect, in keeping with modern Victorian ideas of professional practice.

Brown's professional innovations were reflected in W. M. Rossetti's professional criticism. The writer called for more documentation so that the critic and historian might make ever more accurate and enlightening use of them. Science too could come to the aid of the painter, as it had to other professions. It would appear natural, continued Rossetti, for the important modern painter to keep a photographic record of his work as well as written descriptions. This article, Brown's exhibition, and the detailed catalogue that accompanied that exhibition,—together these materials marked an important development in the practice of modern art. These events and practices effectively reflected the changes that were taking place in the art market and in the identity of the art buying public. But they also pointed to a change in the nature of the way the artist worked, the way the critic worked, and the relationship between the two. That change is most easily identified as one that was moving towards a modern understanding of what constitutes a professional practice. Professionalism was now moving away from, or reforming, those institutions, like the Royal Academy, founded in the eighteenth century.

In contrast to Brown's 'manly' and direct exhibitions, Rossetti formulated a strategy that seemed to contradict Victorian ideas of masculine independence. Brown's opposition to establishment control of exhibiting consisted of producing alternative exhibitions. The ambitions of Millais and Hunt were served by provincial exhibitions and, in the case of Millais, the Academy and popular success. But the popularity of contemporary art both in the provinces and through the medium of mass-reproduction had a limited life. The modern road to success was not one that could be based on popular acclaim, rather it was one founded on the esoteric and the avant-garde. Rossetti's professional development

demonstrates not only a life in contradiction to the traditional Academic route but also a successful alternative to the careers of the remaining Brethren which only seem viable in the booming Victorian art market. In the next chapter I am going to examine in more detail the way in which Rossetti and Millais demonstrate two different tendencies in the development of the Victorian professional artist. While Millais followed the established route through associateship and membership of the Royal Academy, Rossetti promoted his work through his relationships with his family, critics, patrons and other artists.

Notes to Chapter Three

¹ 'A Pre-Raphaelite Exhibition' in the Saturday Review (4 July 1857), 11.

² Harold Perkin, The Rise of Professional Society: England since 1880 (London: Routledge, 1989), 23.

³ See Laing Art Gallery, Pre-Raphaelites: Painters and Patrons in the North East (Newcastle upon Tyne: Tyne and Wear Museums Service, 1989), for a discussion of the identification of Pre-Raphaelitism as an avant-garde movement.

⁴ — — —, 'The Royal Academy. The Eighty-Second Exhibition—1850', Art-Journal (1 June 1850), 165.

⁵ The Royal Academy continued to occupy the National Gallery rooms for the next few years, its final destination being heralded in this same journal in 1854 with a short notice that the 'purchase of Burlington House, Piccadilly, of the trustees of the Hon. C. C. Cavendish, is to cost £140,000; it is freehold, and is to be devoted to public use.' Art-Journal 6 (1854), 250.

⁶ William Michael Rossetti, 'Mr Palgrave and Unprofessional Criticisms on Art', Fine Art, Chiefly Contemporary: Notices Reprinted, with revisions [1867] (New York: AMS Press, 1970), 324 – 334.

⁷ Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Frederick Startridge Ellis (Ellis was the publisher of D. G. Rossetti's book of poetry), Saturday, 14 May 1870. Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, 5 vols. eds. Oswald Doughty and John Robert Wahl (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 2:875.

⁸ According to his son's biography Millais received £250 for this painting from a Mr White, a dealer; plus an extra £50 because of the considerable profit made from the engraving. John Guille Millais, Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais PRA, 2 vols. (London: Methuen, 1899), 1:147. The later Black Brunswicker, on a similar theme, sold to Ernest Gambart for one thousand guineas, *ibid.*, 1:354.

⁹ J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:215.

¹⁰ Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites, 132.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 129.

¹² Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Christina Rossetti, 8 November 1853, in J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:217.

¹³ Millais to Thomas Combe, George Inn, Hayes, Bromley, Tuesday Night, October, 1852, in J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:172.

¹⁴ Stephen Wildman, 'Opportunity and Philanthropy: the Pre-Raphaelites as seen and collected in Birmingham', in Vision of Love and Life: Pre-Raphaelite Art from the Birmingham Collection, England, catalogue to exhibition (Seattle and tour: Art Services International) 1995-6 (forthcoming).

¹⁵ Millais to Thomas Combe, 83, Gower Street, March, 1852, in J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:161.

¹⁶ — — —, 'Society of Artists' Exhibition', Birmingham Journal (11 September 1852), supplement, 1.

¹⁷ Millais to Thomas Combe, 16 December, 1852, J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:186-9.

¹⁸ See Stephen Wildman, 'Opportunity and Philanthropy'.

¹⁹ — — —, 'Society of Artists' Exhibition: Third Notice', Birmingham Journal (15 October, 1853), supplement, 1.

²⁰ J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:297.

²¹ Millais to Effie Millais, 8 May 1856, in J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:299-300.

²² Millais to Effie Millais, 4 May 1856, in J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:299.

²³ Millais to Effie Millais, 1 May 1856, in J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:296-7.

²⁴ John Ruskin, Preface to 'Academy Notes of 1855', Pre-Raphaelitism, Everyman's Library, ed. Ernest Rhys, (London: Dent, n.d.), 177.

²⁵ F. G. Stephens Papers, The Bodleian Library, Oxford. MSS.DON.e.76:28.

²⁶ Jeremy Maas, Gambart: Prince of the Victorian Art World (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1975), 51.

²⁷ See Maas, Gambart, 51.

²⁸ Art-Union, March 1848, in Maas, Gambart, 51.

²⁹ Dante Gabriel Rossetti, from an undisclosed source in Maas, Gambart, 145.

³⁰ William Bell Scott, Autobiographical Notes of the life of William Bell Scott, 2 vols., ed. W. Minto [1892] (New York: AMS Press, 1970), 2:47.

³¹ Georgiana Burne-Jones, Memorials of Edward Burne-Jones, 2 vols. [1904] (New York: Libraries Press, 1971), 1:190.

³² William Michael Rossetti, Ruskin: Rossetti: Preraphaelitism, Papers 1854-1862 [1899] (New York: AMS Press, 1971), 284.

³³ F. G. Stephens to W. M. Rossetti, 13 September 1861, in W. M. Rossetti, Ruskin: Rossetti, 289.

³⁴ G. Burne-Jones, Memorials, 1:190.

³⁵ Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Ford Madox Brown, Christmas, December 1858, in W. M. Rossetti, Ruskin: Rossetti, 215.

³⁶ W. M. Rossetti to F. G. Stephens, 9 October 1866, Stephens Papers, Bodleian, MSS.DON.e.76:89.

³⁷ Scott, Autobiographical Notes, 2:39.

³⁸ G. Burne-Jones, Memorials, 1:260.

³⁹ W. M. Rossetti, Fine Art, 8.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 146. This remark was made in a review of The International Exhibition, London, which first appeared in the London Review, 1862.

⁴² Matthew Pilkington, A General Dictionary of Painters [1829], revised Allan Cunningham (London: Thomas Tegg, 1840), 281 – 284 .

⁴³ Théophile Gautier, 'English Art from a French Point of View: 1', translated (with a few explanatory notes) by the editor [George Augustus Sala], Temple Bar 5 (July 1862), 320 – 326.

⁴⁴ W. M. Rossetti, Fine Art, 146.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 146.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 146-7.

⁴⁷ William Hogarth, 'The Anecdotes of William Hogarth', in Simon Eliot and Beverley Stern, The Age of Enlightenment: An Anthology of eighteenth-Century Texts, 2 vols. (London: Ward Lock Educational, in association with The Open University, 1979), 2:77.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 2:79.

⁴⁹ Maas, Gambart, 110.

⁵⁰ Aaron Scharf, 'Unit 7 William Hogarth', A204, The Enlightenment (Milton Keynes: The Open University Press, 1979), 71.

⁵¹ Scott, Autobiographical Notes, 2:47.

⁵² W. M. Rossetti, Ruskin: Rossetti, 261.

⁵³ Ford Madox Brown, The Diary of Ford Madox Brown, ed. Virginia Surtees (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 197.

⁵⁴ Brown, Diary, 198. This entry is for 17 January 1858, and covers the period since Brown's last entry of March 1857.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 198. Brown also notes 'Plint offered £200 for the Christ & Peter painting, still at Manchester.' This was the 'Art Treasures' Exhibition, held from January to October, 1857.

⁵⁶ Mary Bennett, 'A Check List of Pre-Raphaelite Pictures exhibited at Liverpool 1846—67, and some of their Northern Collectors,' Burlington Magazine 105 (November 1963), 489.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 489.

⁵⁸ The following letter from D. G. Rossetti to Brown, in March 1856, demonstrates the complex professional considerations involved in the various kinds of

exhibitions and the ever present thoughts of Academy exhibiting even in the mind of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, who never exhibited there:

I saw Hunt's Scapegoat and other works the other night. The two for this year admirable, but not calculated, I fear, for full public impression. He was talking a great deal to Woodward and me about his lasting views of an exhibition next year, and says he will not put his name down for ARA'.... 'I suppose, though, he'll stick to the RA this year; but felt at liberty to speak about it, feeling quite convinced of his best course, and not having any work to join with his in such a scheme—nor shall I even next year probably, if as seems likely hitherto, the scheme for Manchester proceeds.

William Rossetti notes:

'That scheme for Manchester' must, I suppose, have had some relation to the great Art Treasures Exhibition there in 1857. How this was expected to affect my brother I cannot now recollect.'

W. M. Rossetti, *Ruskin*: Rossetti, 128.

⁵⁹ 'An exhibition of British painting to be sent to New York and other American cities had been projected by Captain Ruxton, a retired army officer. Brown chose the pictures and W. M. Rossetti acted as secretary. The exhibition (1857) met with little success owing to its association with Gambart who had combined with the promoters of the exhibition and had shown watercolours of his own choice.'

Brown, *Diary*, 199, n.8. For a detailed discussion of the exhibition see Susan P.

Casteras, English Pre-Raphaelitism and its Reception in America in the

Nineteenth Century (Cranbury N. J.: Associated University Press, 1990), 43—68.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 199.

⁶¹ Ernest Gambart to W. M. Rossetti, 21 July 1857, regarding the English Art Exhibition in New York:

I am told on every side, you represent only a very small body of men & have no support of the accademical [sic] body & the generality of artists.'

Maas goes on to relate that:

The travelling exhibition was almost a complete failure. The opening in New York on 19 October coincided with one of the greatest financial calamities of the century. 'Every day brings some startling crash,' Ruxton reported to William Rossetti in despair, 'and literally money is not to be had.'

Maas, Gambart, 95.

⁶² Brown's editor, Virginia Surtees, writes:

Brown is here referring to the Manchester 'Art Treasures' exhibition where he admired No. 42 Wings of a Diptych, with portrait of Richard II (Early English), surely the Wilton Diptych (National Gallery), now believed to be French.

Brown, Diary, 201, n.17.

⁶³ Interestingly Burne-Jones moved into rooms nearby early in the following year:

He [Edward Burne-Jones] was more than eager for work, but first came the search for fresh rooms, [then Edward Burne-Jones writes to Georgiana Burne-Jones] 'I have had such a week of fatigues as I have never had before and am pretty well knocked up – the rooms are dear but very good, well-lighted, large and clean.' [GBJ continues] They were on the first floor of a house at the corner of Russell Place and Howland Street.

It may be the case that Burne-Jones's move prompted in him the idea to continue the intimate Pre-Raphaelite exhibitions in the new guise of the Hogarth Club. G. Burne-Jones, Memorials, 1:188.

⁶⁴ The Saturday Review (4 July 1857), 11.

⁶⁵ Alvin Sullivan, British Literary Magazines: The Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837-1913 (Westport, Connecticut: The Greenwood Press, 1984), 379.

⁶⁶ Mary Bennett, 'A Check List of Pre-Raphaelite Pictures Exhibited at Liverpool 1846–67', 489.

⁶⁷ From about 1861 F. G. Stephens began to write art criticism for the Athenaeum, and certainly from the end of that decade, the reputation of the journal in this field grew. Stephens continued to write for the Athenaeum until 1901, when Roger Fry replaced him.

⁶⁸ 'Fine-Art Gossip', a review of the Pre-Raphaelite Exhibition, Athenaeum (11 July 1857), 886. The writer of the Athenaeum review was perhaps Mr Walter Thornbury according to W. M. Rossetti, *Ruskin*: Rossetti, 172.

⁶⁹ Alvin Sullivan, British Literary Magazines: The Romantic Age, 1789-1836 (Westport, Connecticut: The Greenwood Press, 1983), 21-24.

⁷⁰ Griselda Pollock, Vision and Difference (London: Routledge, 1988), 96.

⁷¹ W. M. Rossetti, Fine Art, 6.

⁷² The Art-Journal, 27 (March 1865), 156.

⁷³ The Athenaeum, (11 March 1865), 353.

⁷⁴ William Michael Rossetti, Rossetti Papers, 1862 to 1870 (1903; New York: AMS Press, 1970), 139.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁷⁶ Alvin Sullivan, British Literary Magazines: The Romantic Age (1983), 424–433.

⁷⁷ William Michael Rossetti, 'Mr Madox Brown's Exhibition, and its Place in Our School of Painting', Fraser's Magazine (May 1865), 598-607.

4 Professionals, Consumers and Cliques

I

In his book on Rossetti, A Victorian Romantic, Oswald Doughty produces the following summation of Millais's career:

His marriage had subordinated all artistic aims to financial success, so, abandoning his earlier manner of work, he began to follow the vulgar taste of the general public.¹

Millais's tragedy is that he knew the public's taste to be vulgar yet stooped to satisfy it. His justification was that he needed to put food in the mouths of his wife and children. Millais said of the public: 'As I must live, they shall have what they want'.² Doughty invites us to compare the bourgeois sail-trimming of Millais with the unmaterialist bohemianism of Rossetti. But the differences in the approach of the two artists to their profession is neither simple nor clear-cut. In the same book Doughty refers to a letter Rossetti wrote to Brown: 'I finished Trist's [Trist was a Brighton wine merchant] pot-boiler today, and lo! the pot shall boil for a season.' A few days later he continued in the same vein: 'I have been at work on it exactly eight days, so it pays better than most things, though cheap'.³ Essentially Rossetti was prepared to produce art for no other reason than that it was saleable.

In this chapter I nevertheless intend to examine the ways in which Rossetti's, rather than Millais's, experience of the Victorian art world, reveals the

emerging professional ideal as a formative factor in the development of the modern artist. Harold Perkin writes:

Since great structural transformations reflect profound changes in mental outlook, the professional social ideal—the professional's ideal of how society should be organised and of the ideal citizen to organise it—began to infiltrate men's minds and replace the entrepreneurial ideal on which Victorian society had been founded. . . . The difference was that the entrepreneur proved himself by competition in the market, the professional by persuading the rest of society and ultimately the state that his service was vitally important and therefore worthy of guaranteed reward. The first called for as little state interference as possible; the second looked to the state as the ultimate guarantor of professional status.⁴

The differences that delineate the respective careers of Millais and Rossetti can be found within the dichotomy of the entrepreneurial and the professional ideals. I will particularly look at their professional dealings with John Ruskin, Ford Madox Brown, F. G. Stephens and W. M. Rossetti as embodied in exchanges of work, advice, money and favours. And I shall argue that while Millais provided a model of art suited to the entrepreneurial ideal of success in the marketplace Rossetti can be associated with a superseding ideal that admits to no other evaluation except that of recognised peers. Central to this discussion is the belief that both ideals challenge the division between trade and vocation. It is this aspect of the formation of the modern professional artist that makes him or her into a figure of importance in the development of the professional ideal.

The identification of Rossetti as a paradigm of the romantic bohemian, as well as the easily recognised portraits of women in many guises, caused his later work and that of his followers to become forever associated with the term Pre-Raphaelite. By 1899 the over identification by 'the public' of the 'eclectic and poetic' work of Burne-Jones and the later Rossetti with Pre-Raphaelitism, was an established distortion that knowledgeable writers were at pains to correct.⁵ While the earlier hard edged Pre-Raphaelite work springs from a scientific professionalism generated by the entrepreneurial ideal, later Pre-Raphaelitism is opposed to the dictum of material and industrial progress. The professional problem that initially faced Holman Hunt and Millais was how to avoid being formed in the image of a moribund Royal Academy. Although early Pre-Raphaelitism is essentially romantic in its involvement with nature and the medieval past, Hunt and Millais approach this problem by developing a new style. The basis of this style, in its meticulous execution and painstaking realism, is an aesthetic equivalent for modern science, at a time when increasingly professional scientists still felt able to co-exist with the entrepreneurial ideal.

Early Pre-Raphaelitism survived because it was able to command a market. Millais's A Huguenot, on St Bartholomew's Day (1852) gained a popular success that forced the critics to re-evaluate Pre-Raphaelitism. As well as winning the £50 Liverpool prize, the Huguenot was sold to the dealer D. T. White for £250, who then paid another £50 when a print of the painting was issued in 1856.⁶ By this time, Pre-Raphaelitism had achieved a brand identity that clearly separates their work from earlier products and is widely publicised in a vociferous periodical debate. It is significant that White had bought and sold the Huguenot to B. G. Windus (a collector who was to become an important patron of Pre-

Raphaelite painting) before the opening of the Royal Academy exhibition. In the mid-1850s, apart from the lone voice of Ruskin, criticism of the PRB had shown itself to be steadfastly opposed to the new school. Only after dealers and public began to show an interest in spending money on Pre-Raphaelite work did the non-Pre-Raphaelite critics and the Royal Academy re-evaluate that work. It is also important to remember that in many individual cases the critic and the Academician were the same person: a situation that was beginning to appear unhealthy. Underlying their artistic recriminations, the objection of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood to the Royal Academy was that it promoted an unfair restriction on trade. This objection is essentially located within a debate on free trade and is evidence of a degree of support for the entrepreneurial ideal. Rossetti, however, can never be viewed as truly involved in the entrepreneurial ideal. He was much more in sympathy with the younger Edward Burne-Jones and William Morris whose social sensitivity would seek to deny the existence of the industrial world entirely, Jones by painting more angels and Morris by embracing romantic socialism. Essentially, Rossetti and Millais followed two divergent professional paths, both of which developed during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Precisely what identifies those different paths will be considered in the next section.

II

Rossetti's sensibility not only marks his difference from Millais's more combative and public style but also identifies a growing disparity between an earlier professionalism and the emergence of the professional ideal. One important service that the professional ideal performed for the artist was to finally separate painting from the stigma of trade. Although the argument that painting should

enjoy the same intellectual standing as poetry had been postulated by artists from Leonardo da Vinci to Sir Joshua Reynolds, it was still the case in the 1850s that the painter's studio was too much like his shop. Rossetti's own attitude to the sale of his pictures was essentially founded in a concept of loss in the compromise that characterised their public consumption that contrasted with the privacy of creation. In the autumn of 1857 he sought advice on the publication of his own poetry from the poet William Allingham:

When I think of how old most of these [his poems] are, it seems like a sort of mania to keep thinking of them still; but I suppose one's leaning still to them depends mainly on their having no trade associations, and being still a sort of thing of one's own.⁷

At some point in the time between Rossetti's letter and Doughty's book a certain type of practice in painting had taken on the same privacy that poetry enjoyed in Rossetti's imagination. Or at least a certain sort of painter had assumed the status of the poet. Within thirty years of Rossetti's letter the debate had moved from one between trade and vocation to one based on recognition of an intrinsic special status above the marketplace that was enjoyed by the true artist. In an exchange that took place after Rossetti's death, Millais defended his own practice to Holman Hunt in terms of posterity's judgement: 'What good would recognition of my labours hundreds of years hence do me?'⁸ Pre-Raphaelitism could be said to be indicative of a decisive movement in the parameters of Victorian professional debate. Between the 1850s and the 1880s the indices of a popular success and a general belief in the importance of an artist become increasingly less likely to be associated, in the critical mind, with the career of a serious artist. This

transformation depends upon the hegemony of two conflicting middle-class ideals – the entrepreneurial ideal and the professional ideal.

The difficulty that exists in identifying the difference in the approach of these two ideals can be clarified by looking at the criticism of Marion Harry Spielmann. Spielmann was an influential writer and art critic and, eventually, editor of the Magazine of Art in the 1880s and 1890s. In an article on Spielmann, Julie F. Codell has examined the relationship between the professionalization of the artist and the specialist press.⁹ Codell sees this debate as centred on raising the status and income of artists by promoting their skill, education and respectability to harness a 'new upper middle-class consumerism'.¹⁰ She draws on N. N. Feltes's Marxist study, Modes of Production of Victorian Novels (1986), to provide a model for the professionalization of the artist similar to that which Feltes uses for Victorian writing. Feltes describes one dilemma for the Victorian writer which Codell outlines as:

the process of professionalizing, contradictory components of vocation (something done willingly as a commitment) and entrepreneurship (something done for financial gain) [which] must be co-ordinated and rectified.¹¹

Spielmann edited the Magazine of Art for seventeen years between 1887 and 1904.

These are critical years in the development of Perkin's professional society.

However, my argument is that professionalism does not work to co-ordinate and rectify the 'contradictory components' of vocation and entrepreneurship. Rather, I would claim that professionalism polarises vocation and entrepreneurship – or (perhaps better), polarises those who practice them. It is significant that

Spielmann was most concerned with the world of conventional academic art and

the expanding print market: he promoted, in effect, the path Millais took.

Spielmann described the 1898 Millais Exhibition as 'the most important purely artistic event of the nineteenth century'.¹² But while he favoured academic art, Spielmann had little time for the Royal Academy. In 1886 he accused the Royal Academy of running a monopoly while maintaining that it was the British Institution which represented free trade.¹³ Spielmann's intention was to confirm the professional status of the artist through an emphasis on intellectual and professional skills which were worthy of high reward, both financial and social. This contrasts with the development of the avant-garde artist who comes to be valued for personal qualities that elevate an individual vision above notions of mere trade, no matter how socially valuable. While the first approach may establish professional status, the second forms its ideological foundation.

Although the problem of reconciling the image of the gentlemanly professional with that of the artist was a real one for Spielmann, to my mind it is not the problem that needs to be addressed when examining a context that recognises the emerging professional ideal. Spielmann's dilemma was produced by the conflicting ideals of the professional and entrepreneurial middle classes. The problem that Spielmann perceived (that art was increasingly being placed under commercial pressures as patronage moved from the 'Cathedral to the Stock Exchange') would be resolved when the ideological concept of the artist became important as a 'natural' symbol for professional society of what the professional ideal involved. Spielmann's attempts to correlate the demands of the entrepreneurial ideal in his championship of market values, while insisting on the nature of the artist as serious, educated and socially valuable, is indicative of the underlying question for the professional. Is the independence and altruism of the

professional compromised by the payments of the marketplace? It was the formation of an ideology that naturalised the concept of professional integrity that made professional society possible. As Perkin explains:

the professional's ideal of how society should be organised and of the ideal citizen to organise it—began to infiltrate men's minds and replace the entrepreneurial ideal on which Victorian society had been founded.¹⁴

Spielmann opposed the developing avant-garde in his reviews and maintained the academic and commercial values of entrepreneurial society. By arguing for the autonomy of the artist, and by maintaining that the artist was a public servant, Spielmann was clearly propagating views that would identify the artist with the modern professional.¹⁵ In this respect, Spielmann identified a true conflict: the dichotomy between the artist as pursuing a profession and as a producer for a large consumer market. His method of resolving this division of interests was to stress the quality of the artist's vision and life as justification for the rewards the individual artist received. The solution that was ultimately offered by the hegemony of professional society, on the other hand, removed the artist entirely from the marketplace. The genius of the artist demanded that art was pursued for its own sake and while individual works may be bought their cost can never reflect their true creative value. While that value rests in the rarity of true genius, it can never be owned—according to the professional ideal—and thus defiled, but only rented. In other words, a true talent is determined not by the artist's success in the market place but by the evaluation of fellow professionals and by disinterested professional criticism.

The nature of this rarity of talent is already being outlined by Ruskin in 1857 when, in a review of Millais's Dream of the Past, he writes:

inventive painters, who are not only true in all they do, but compose and relieve the truths they paint, so as to give to each the utmost possible value; which last class is in all ages a very small one; and it is a matter to congratulate a nation upon, when an artist rises in the midst of it who gives any promise of belonging to this great Imaginative group of Masters.¹⁶

Ruskin was, of course, suggesting that while Millais had shown promise of being such an imaginative master in the past that promise was now proving to be false. The debate around Pre-Raphaelitism in the period leading up to the emergence of the professional ideal was developing into a discussion on what constituted the aims and activities of the professional artist.

Perkin identifies the professional ideal as emerging from the very utilitarian thinkers who argued for the free market and the progress of science. The statistical enquiries of such men as Edwin Chadwick were undertaken with a view to producing in the social sphere the spirit of progress and efficiency that was believed to exist in the industry and commerce of the entrepreneur. It became increasingly obvious to those statisticians, as the century progressed, that the industrial society was producing new social problems and was neither willing nor able to regulate itself. Professionals like Chadwick had believed that a well intentioned market-regulated society would right the social wrongs that their empirical statistical researches had identified. However, by the 1860s the increasingly proscriptive factories and employment acts indicated the rift between the professional and entrepreneurial fractions of the middle classes. It is this

scepticism which informs the second phase of professionalism. Pre-Raphaelitism begins as an art that is in many ways a visual equivalent of the intellectual fraction of the entrepreneurial middle class but, through Rossetti, it leads to an art that can underwrite the idealism of the emerging professional class.

In what ways, then, does Rossetti's artistic production and, just as importantly, his life conform to demands on art and the artist to provide an ideological justification for professionalism? The approach to this question lies in the idea that the artist comes to represent an absolute in professional integrity. The institutional key to the artist's status is embedded at the core of a concept that underlies the professional ideal: the separation of interest. It is this separation of interest that allows the development of a more professional practice for all artists and allows them to distance themselves from the marketplace. There are two important developments that ensure that this important separation takes place around the practice of art in Britain during the third quarter of the nineteenth century: the emergence of knowledgeable art critics who are not practising artists, and the activities of specialist art dealers. Both Millais and Rossetti are responding to innovations in the art market in the 1850s and 1860s when it would have been unclear what the implications of those responses would be. Millais followed a professional path that embraces the masculine public sphere of the patriarchal middle class. The nature of the public path to fame that Millais travelled, and its relationship to a masculine sphere of business and commercialisation, is the topic to which I now turn.

III

Millais was an artist whose early career had benefited from changing professional practices in the art market. Such practices included extensive critical debate in the

expanding periodical market as well as the activities of the growing dealer system. The dealers were attracted by the fame or notoriety engendered by the periodical debate and the opportunities offered by the growing popular market for the Fine Art print. As Millais's identification as the leading proponent of the Pre-Raphaelite school began to weaken, the dealers became cautious. Millais had begun to raise his prices just at the time when collectors who favoured Pre-Raphaelite works were unsure of his status and the dealers of his popularity. Yet, when Millais tried to maximise his own income by cutting dealers' profits, he still expected the dealers' continued support:

When I sold my works to the dealers they were my friends, and counteracted this artistic detraction. There is, without doubt, an immense amount of underhand work, and I can scarcely regard a single professional man as my friend.¹⁷

With every 'professional man' turning against him, Millais relied totally upon public opinion: 'The enmity is almost overwhelming, and nothing but the public good sense will carry me through'.¹⁸

Millais's concerns are the traditionally middle-class preoccupations of sales and prices. Yet he seems unwilling to admit that his present situation has been achieved by positive criticism and a buoyant, dealer led, market, as we saw in Chapter Two. Rather than perceiving his early success as the fortuitous result of several factors, Millais preferred to consider the reverse. It is Millais's belief that his present difficulties were the result of a conspiracy to see him fail. Millais believed that it was the combination of enemies that caused his problems:

April 29th [1859]. — I have just come from the private view. To tell you the truth, I think it likely I shall not sell one of the pictures. The clique

has been most successful against me this year, and few people look at my work. Ruskin was there, looking at 'The Nuns'; and Tom Taylor, who said nothing. Everywhere I hear of the infamous attempts to destroy me (the truth is these pictures are not vulgar enough for general appreciation).¹⁹

Taylor was an influential art critic who often wrote for the Times and of whose reviews Millais clearly had limited expectations. The Times, it should be noted, had been foremost among the journals in its criticism of Pre-Raphaelitism and had prompted Ruskin's original letters of support for the movement. Yet Millais was not in retreat from the accumulation of adverse criticism. He maintained a steadfast belief in the quality of his own work and the soundness of his own judgement of it. That is why he set a high price on The Vale of Rest; it reflected his own critical opinion of the work. But later, he began to fear that the pricing of his work too was in fact working against him:

April 19th [1859]. — ..by putting a very high price on it [£1000], the dealers are entirely shut out, and thereby become my most inveterate enemies, which is no joke considering the powerful influence they have.²⁰

The dealers, like Ruskin, had helped to establish Millais's early reputation. While Ruskin had promoted Millais as the leading talent in a new artistic movement it was the dealers who had acted upon his new found notoriety. Unable to sell The Vale of Rest for one thousand pounds, Millais dropped the price a few weeks later. He sold the painting for seven hundred guineas to the dealer D. T. White. White in turn was buying the work for B. G. Windus, a collector who had already

shown an interest in Pre-Raphaelite work.²¹ In the end, we must assume that Millais thought it politic to allow the dealers their profit.

Millais, therefore, was caught between conflicting aspects of a professional world that, like the society it served, was in a state of transition. Middle-class values were beginning to modify the habits of an aristocratic society. Yet the values of the middle class were far from fixed in themselves. A greater reliance on the results of scientific investigation and growing wealth and power, as well as the visible effects of industrialisation, encouraged a re-evaluation of established middle-class beliefs and mores. While Millais and his fellow Pre-Raphaelites had challenged the old professional establishment of the Academy there was as yet no firmly established alternative for professional advancement. Even as the art market seemed to be expanding to fulfil a laissez-faire entrepreneurial ideal, critics and artists were already involved in the practice of a professional activity that would supplant that ideal. Millais had benefited from a modern notoriety and had been the centre of an important artistic debate. When he became isolated from that movement both in terms of critical rejection and in his own artistic practice he was left with a choice of two apparent alternatives. These were the old establishment represented by the Royal Academy or the popular market developing around the print and entrepreneurial dealers. In the event, the course Millais chose, that of the popular market, would ultimately dominate the Royal Academy. But in 1859 his paintings, losing credibility as Pre-Raphaelite productions, were left only with their value as commodities. Millais was courted by the dealers in the first flower of his popularity, but the demand was transient. The growing uncertainty that seemed to surround the reputation of the leading young painter of the modern school was clearly as embarrassing for the dealers as

it was hurtful to Millais: 'Gambart was there, and several dealers, but none spoke to me. They are not anxious to look into my eyes just now, and no wonder!'²²

Millais's work was at the mercy of the new capitalist marketplace. Great rewards were available but only for the artist whose work was in demand.

That said, Millais still received personal moral support from some of his old friends: 'Hunt and Leech, as well as the Rossetti's and their clique, have expressed their admiration of my work of late',²³ But this was not always the public position. Certainly W. M. Rossetti's journal reviews of Millais's paintings reprinted in Fine Art reflect similar concerns to Ruskin's. In 1857 W. M. Rossetti wrote of Millais Academy paintings that year that they indicated 'a turning-point in Mr Millais's career, undoubtedly perilous'.²⁴ Millais's reference to the 'Rossetti clique' demonstrates his understanding that there is a unity of feeling gathering around Dante Gabriel Rossetti of which he is no longer a part. Increasingly, Millais began to take comfort from those Academicians, like Edwin Landseer, who were not part of the group ranged against him. Millais's letters of the period frequently mention Landseer as a supporter. In these writings, he notes that Landseer understands the market and has the necessary contacts, assuring Millais that a buyer can be found for The Vale of Rest at the price asked.²⁵ In the event, we must presume that Landseer was not able to fulfil this promise as Millais sold the painting to a dealer for a lower price. Nevertheless, Landseer's own popularity and success in the Victorian entrepreneurial art world became the model for Millais's own ambitions.

Millais made a decisive response to increasing isolation from Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelite group that was centred on Rossetti, and to continued journalistic and Academic criticism. He produced The Black Brunswicker, a

reworking of A Huguenot Refusing to Wear the Catholic Badge on the Eve of St Bartholomew. The painting that had paved the way for his original popularity. Like the Huguenot, The Black Brunswicker features two young lovers caught in a moment when love is being sacrificed to the cause of honour and duty. In this case it is the duty of a cavalry officer on the eve of Waterloo. His sweetheart seeks to hold shut the door while he insists on opening it. The painting's appearance at the 1860 Academy exhibition restored his standing with dealers and the public, if not with Ruskin and his enemies within the Academy. The success of The Black Brunswicker and later paintings established the popular path of Millais's career. While it was a career that was affected by changes that middle-class hegemony had wrought on the British art world, it was decidedly one that reflected the ideal of the entrepreneurial fraction of that class. As Millais was poised between failure and popular success – since in 1859 critics, dealers and the market seemed to have deserted him – he rested his hopes in the judgement of the future. Late in his career, as his debate with Hunt showed, Millais realised that posterity would not judge him kindly. An artist, Millais then maintained, should paint for the time in which he lived. Yet in those earlier days, Millais, far from negating the value of posterity as the judge of his status, appealed to it as his final arbiter. In a letter to his wife on 10 May 1859, he wrote that only 'when I am dead will they know their [the paintings in the Academy Exhibition] worth'.²⁶

But this was not a position that Millais cared to hold. The need to maintain a growing family in a respectable middle-class style proved greater than his aversion to 'vulgarity.' Once Millais had forsaken the virtuous path he seems to have wholeheartedly pursued the vulgar. In embracing the popular market and the entrepreneurial ideal, Millais was opting for a measure of his work that

depended on its current price. The demands of the market were accessibility and popularity. The great error that Millais made was in underestimating the growing importance of art criticism. In choosing public opinion as the judge of his worth, Millais effectively cut himself off from modern standards of professional evaluation. While the Great Man of the early Victorian period could be popular, wealthy, and serious, this was no longer the case. It was increasingly important for the serious professional artist to be appreciated largely by only an intellectual elite, and to be evaluated as important by his peers and critics. In the following section, I will consider how the role of the critic was being re-interpreted and the effect that this had on the careers and reputations of Rossetti and Millais. For as Millais falls out of favour with Pre-Raphaelite critics, Rossetti's star rises.

IV

The period of Ruskin's interest in Rossetti was also that of his first Academy Notes. The years between 1854 and 1859 see Ruskin snipping the ties that bind his critical reputation to the work of Millais. While in the earlier notes of 1855, 1856 and 1857 he continues to praise Millais, if at times with reservations, by 1859 he is able to consider him a spent force. These notes, published within days of Ruskin's visit to the Royal Academy's exhibition opening, are in contrast to his preferred mode of writing. They are far closer to the journalistic reviews that Ruskin despised than they are to his own thoughtful and elegantly phrased books. These notes are significant primarily in their espousal of unambiguous attribution. Kristen Garrigan's essay on the notes makes the point that although popular at the time, their hurried production did not suit Ruskin's literary style. The content of the reviews tend, in Garrigan's opinion, to the superficiality that Ruskin objected to in the press.²⁷

While today the signed review seems almost essential if balanced critical evaluation is to be expected, the opinions of mid-Victorian commentators were altogether less clear-cut. Some of Ruskin's contemporaries clearly felt that he wielded more power than the anonymous reviewer and that this was to the detriment of the artists he criticised. Garrigan mentions a review of William Windus's Too Late of 1859, now in the Tate Gallery, as a painting that suffered Ruskin's ridicule.²⁸ While Ruskin's review was cast in the same ironic language that was typical of such reviews, his name and reputation gave added bite and significance to his criticisms. Ruskin is almost flippant in the way in which he dismisses the efforts of the young painter. He declared:

either this painter has been ill: or his picture has been sent to the Academy in a hurry; or he has sickened his temper and dimmed his sight by reading melancholy ballads.²⁹

He goes on to suggest that Windus gives up 'puling and pining over deserted ladies' and get himself into more healthy company, listening to music and improving his health with 'athletic exercises.' The fact that Windus had indeed been suffering from ill-health was the occasion of some regret to Ruskin when he learned of this matter. He added a postscript to that year's notes in which he offered the artist his assurance of his 'deep respect' for Windus's genius. Ruskin went on to maintain his 'conviction that, with returning strength, he [Windus] may one day take highest rank amongst masters of expression'.³⁰ While the tone of Ruskin's criticism may have been too robust for Windus, we might perhaps be excused for being impressed by the insight and accuracy of the review. Windus, whose reaction cannot help but remind us of Rossetti's, never exhibited at the Royal Academy again and all but gave up painting altogether. While anyone who

has seen the painting may, with some justification, feel that the loss to Victorian and Pre-Raphaelite art was not great, we should bear in mind Windus's strong and valuable support for Pre-Raphaelite work in the Liverpool Academy's exhibitions. However, Ruskin's growing influence does point to an important development in art criticism. The increased significance of the signed review was not ignored by W. M. Rossetti and other critics interested in an emerging professional code of behaviour. Yet anonymity was still worth discussing in 1889 by both W. M. Rossetti in the preface to Dante Gabriel Rossetti as Designer and Writer, and by P. G. Hamerton in the revised edition of Thoughts About Art (1889), first published in 1873.

In the revised edition of his book, Hamerton writes on the function and nature of art criticism. It is a clear indication of a growing concern amongst those employed in this activity of the need for its greater professionalization. Hamerton points to the current poverty in the qualifications of many journalistic art critics and discusses the need for change. One of the primary functions of the critic in his opinion is the instruction of the public in a knowledge of art. It is Ruskin whom Hamerton sees as a critic willing to undertake this role but who has himself been criticised as showing 'contempt for the public as soon as he implies his opinion that the public is generally ignorant of painting'.³¹ Hamerton clearly believes Ruskin's contempt to be justified. In this essay Hamerton lays down rules for the good and honest art critic. It would perhaps have been more elegant had he managed to keep to a Biblical ten of these commandments, but sincerity demanded eleven.³² In their entirety these rules lay out a clear and professional code for the modern art critic. That is to say, they are professional in the developing sense of that term because they stress duty and altruism. From the

first commandment, 'To utter unpopular truths', to the last, they emphasise the social and spiritual obligations which the critic must satisfy. He or she must 'instruct the public in the theoretical knowledge of art', but also defend the true and smite the false. The echoes of the ideals of knight errantry that informed the professional ideal can be felt in Hamerton's guide for the modern critic. The critic must speak always with sincerity, never letting opinions on his consistency prevent him from changing his mind, nor allowing prejudice to muddy his conclusions. Let us consider how Hamerton's opinions fit in with the practice of Pre-Raphaelite criticism.

In 1889, some seven years after Rossetti's death, W. M. Rossetti published Rossetti as Designer and Writer, in which he came nearest to a biography of his brother. It is clear from this exercise, which is in effect no more than an explicated record of his brother's letters, that W. M. Rossetti had difficulty in finding a language in which to speak of his brother. He says as much in the preface.³³ Although by this time an accomplished and professional art critic, W. M. Rossetti had rarely exercised his critical skills on the work of his brother, and, what is more, such criticism had only appeared in what he calls elsewhere his 'slight' pieces.³⁴ It was not that W. M. Rossetti believed that art criticism should be judiciously balanced and even handed. During his career W. M. Rossetti was often partisan and even passionate in the cause of artists and poets, like Walt Whitman, that he valued. However, he did believe that at least in public his support or lack of it should be seen to arise from a proper professional appreciation of merit, rather than from family obligations. In private W. M. Rossetti worked tirelessly to maintain his brother's reputation as a unique genius.

W. M. Rossetti's view of the critic's role had been forged in the flame of the Pre-Raphaelite controversy. Bias and special pleading were necessary tools for the committed critic but must be seen to be used from genuine belief rather than from family connection. Although on occasion, like many of the art critics of the period, he had reviewed work anonymously, he had never publicly commented on his brother's work at length. He says as much in the collection of his work Fine Art and I have found no evidence to contradict this.³⁵ Millais and Burne-Jones enjoyed the biographical ministrations of near relatives, yet Rossetti, whose brother was an art critic, had to depend upon friends or strangers. While W. M. Rossetti went to considerable lengths to clarify the role and importance of his brother in the origins and development of Pre-Raphaelitism, he never exceeded that which established the documented recollections that he had at hand. We should not suppose from this that W. M. Rossetti would have objected to the works of biography that Millais's son or Burne-Jones's wife produced, for they were not critics. W. M. Rossetti could not use his reputation as an art critic to further the career of his brother, for he considered doing so to be unprofessional.

The prefaces to both Fine Art (1867) and Rossetti as Designer and Writer (1889), however, do contain interesting variations in the explanations they give for W. M. Rossetti's critical neglect of his brother's work. The later book makes much of the inappropriate nature of a relative's reviews that are bound to have the 'taint of consanguinity'.³⁶ His views had undergone a change since the publication of Fine Art. While W. M. Rossetti is at some pains to question the habit of anonymous reviewing, at length and in terms that we would associate with professionalism, he clearly feels that a signed review would give him the freedom to 'express my full and frank opinion of friend or relative'.³⁷ W. M.

Rossetti's reason for the absence of reviews of D. G. Rossetti in this book is simply that his brother did not exhibit publicly. Given the current practice of reviewing paintings that were generally available to the public, W. M. Rossetti, as a professional critic, had had no opportunity to review his brother's work. It is a nice ethical point—but one that is denied to him in 1889.

Following D. G. Rossetti's death in 1882, there were two major sales and three exhibitions, one of which was a retrospective at the Royal Academy of Arts. W. M. Rossetti wrote the catalogue for the second sale at Christie's in May 1883 and six articles in the Art Journal and the Magazine of Art. He also furnished a preface and introduction for the 1886 publication of D. G. Rossetti's Collected Works. So by the time his book was published in 1889, W. M. Rossetti had the material at hand to produce a definitive and critical review of his brother's contribution. It points to the continued development of an ever more rigorous professionalism that what had at least seemed possible to William in 1867 seemed tainted in 1889. The critic no longer felt that he could 'address himself to the task' and expect to gain the 'cordial assent of his readers.'

What little personal comment W. M. Rossetti does express demonstrates the niceness of his new professionalism and contrasts the term 'professional' with its older and alternative meaning. He writes:

I view with some regret the very frequent mention of prices charged and paid; for the works themselves, and their intellectual, artistic, or personal associations, interest me more than any question of prices, and I should like to consult the taste of readers who regard the affair in the same light: but a professional man acts professionally, and prices

are not unnaturally debated and recorded in his correspondence, and I reproduce such detail as I find whether this or on other topics.³⁸

The change towards a new professionalism is indicated by W. M. Rossetti's unease with his brother's apparent interest in money and prices. While he tries to maintain the belief that it is the normal concern of the professional's pursuit of his calling, it is clear from W. M. Rossetti's very discussion of the topic that he does not believe this to be the case. By 1889 the reality of the artist's professional life—that is, the means by which he lives—is becoming an embarrassment to the idealist critic. W. M. Rossetti's prim distaste of such material matters can be contrasted with Rossetti's own pleasure in 1861 on making an advantageous deal: 'Yesterday I sold for £25 a coloured sketch which had taken me about half an hour. That paid'.³⁹

In the statement that prefaced Rossetti as Designer and Writer, W. M. Rossetti makes clear what it is that should be of interest to the serious critic. He argues that attention must first be given to the work of art itself, then the ideas that produced it and the skills that express those ideas. Finally those aspects of the personal life of the artist that help in the understanding of his work should be considered. This is a rigorous agenda and not one that is echoed in the glib and facile reviews of the daily press but is clearly an ideal that is informing the more thoughtful reviews in the art journals. W. M. Rossetti himself would follow, as he did for Brown's 1865 exhibition, a short or hasty review with a longer and more thoughtful piece.

It is difficult not to compare the Rossetti brothers and contrast W. M. Rossetti's careful and punctilious professionalism with the apparent indecorum that was only too evident in Rossetti's life. For D. G. Rossetti seemed to behave

with a selfish unconcern for the problems, pain or difficulties that he caused to others, ignoring good advice and disappointing trust. This failure of sympathy for others was manifest from the beginning of his career when he exhibited in the Free Exhibition rather than at the Royal Academy, as had been agreed with Hunt and Millais. D. G. Rossetti took advantage of Brown's friendship and loyalty by repeated failures to repay loans that Brown could ill afford in the first place.

When suffering poor health from the effects of alcohol and opiates, D. G. Rossetti subverted the attempts of W. M. Rossetti and Brown to overcome his addiction.

Yet his friends and relations remained faithful, if exasperated, and his fame grew.

It was through the offices of his friends that D. G. Rossetti was able to develop a reputation. He refused to exhibit his paintings publicly and was unhappy with the reception of his published poetry. Understanding how this reclusive behaviour could generate a significant career is central to the problem that this chapter addresses. The nature of how a professional reputation might be better generated in private because of the new professional ideal, is important in understanding the success of D. G. Rossetti.

W. M. Rossetti was able to examine the nuts and bolts of D. G. Rossetti's professional life with some detachment, although Doughty accused him of a certain amount of editorial whitewashing. While this claim may be justified as far as it extended to D. G. Rossetti's private life, especially that part of it which revolved around Elizabeth Siddal and Jane Morris, W. M. Rossetti is usually to be trusted when D. G. Rossetti's work and business matters are discussed. In his study on his brother's work, W. M. Rossetti identified the year 1864 as that in which D. G. Rossetti achieved professional independence. He observes:

Rossetti was now in full swing of employment and commissions – an artist of high reputation in his own circle, although, through his systematic avoidance of exhibition-rooms, the general public of amateurs and connoisseurs was necessarily unaware of his powers and performances, and only vaguely perhaps privy to his existence.⁴⁰

The importance that W. M. Rossetti places on D. G. Rossetti's continued refusal to show his work in public should not necessarily be accepted without question. Rossetti's career demonstrates the dwindling importance of a wider public to the professional artist. By contrast, someone like Millais might appeal to a larger audience but it was the inner circle of critics, dealers, patrons and fellow artists who determined the status of the artist. This important group would have included a generous proportion who had visited the Pre-Raphaelite exhibition of 1857 and those of the later Hogarth Club in which we know D. G. Rossetti to have participated.

While the educated general public may have been unaware of the appearance of D. G. Rossetti's paintings, his name and reputation must have been quite widely known. It was certainly mentioned with reasonable frequency in print from the time of the 1857 Pre-Raphaelite exhibition. In the relatively small world of Pre-Raphaelite patrons and collectors, not to mention the new breed of dealers, D. G. Rossetti was a significant figure. The years between his first sale in 1849 – in this year he sold The Girlhood of the Virgin Mary to a family friend, the Marchioness Dowager of Bath – until 1853 seem to have been devoid of notable sales. But onwards from that year there was a steady widening and increase in the critical and commercial attention that D. G. Rossetti received. We have seen how the private support of W. M. Rossetti benefited the artist, but it is clear that D. G.

Rossetti also needed the more public and material support of other critics – as well as the patronage of art collectors. What is interesting in D. G. Rossetti's career is the significant relationship between critics and collectors in supporting and encouraging his reputation. In the next section I will first show how the conjunction of one careful collector and a distinguished critic began Rossetti's rise in importance within Pre-Raphaelitism, and then I will consider in some detail how a similar partnership operated at the height of his fame.

V

In W. M. Rossetti's biography of his brother at least twenty names of patrons are mentioned up to 1864. Among the early buyers were those important collectors of Pre-Raphaelite work T. E. Plint, George Rae, James Leathart and Francis McCracken of Belfast. McCracken was a ship-broker and merchant, who first began to show interest in D. G. Rossetti's work in 1853. McCracken's involvement in modern art was matched by his caution in purchasing the work of a little known painter. In seeking the advice of Ruskin, McCracken made an important contribution to D. G. Rossetti's fledgling reputation. In 14 April 1854 in a letter to Ford Madox Brown, who had introduced him to McCracken, D. G. Rossetti writes:

McCracken of course sent my drawing to Ruskin, who the other day wrote me an incredible letter about it, remaining mine respectfully (!), and wanting to call. I of course stroked him down in my answer, and yesterday he came. . . He seems in the mood to make my fortune.⁴¹

We cannot question the sincerity of Ruskin's admiration for Rossetti's work. Yet there can be little doubt that, following his split with Millais, the eminent critic was in need of a recipient for his advice and attention. Rossetti was the fortunate

beneficiary of this tutelary vacuum. McCracken had asked Ruskin's opinion of some of Rossetti's earlier works, most notably The Annunciation, in 1853. The drawing that elicited Ruskin's praise was Dante Drawing an Angel in Memory of Beatrice (Plate 10).⁴² The painting depicts the poet kneeling at a window. He has been disturbed in this anniversary tribute to Beatrice by three visitors, one of whom has attracted his attention by touching him on the shoulder. This is a well realised watercolour showing considerable facility in the handling of the medium. The colour is pleasingly clear and the play of light and shadow engaging in its subtlety. While he had sold works of this sort before 1854 for up to twelve pounds, Rossetti was asking around thirty-five pounds for this one. The eventual price paid, due almost entirely to Ruskin's fulsome praise of the work, was fifty pounds.

A watercolour of even greater compositional complexity, entitled Beatrice, Meeting Dante at a Marriage Feast, Denies him her Salutation (Plate 11), and which too illustrates Dante's Vita Nuova, a work that Rossetti had translated as early as 1848, was sold in 1852 to H. T. Wells for about ten pounds. This painting was slightly over half the size (13 3/4 x 16 3/4 inches) of Dante Drawing an Angel but contains many more figures. Dante stands isolated in a small group of three, one a child, on the right of the picture. Beatrice leads the large wedding party that fills the painting from the top left of the picture to just short of the group that Dante stands with. Although the closest of the group to Dante, Beatrice studiously ignores him. The bottom left hand corner shows a female figure almost lost in a wealth of leaves, and a male guest is leaning over a stone banister to offer her his hand. This picture was in fact exhibited by Ernest Gambart at the Winter Exhibition of 1852 in the French Gallery.

There are two things of interest to note here. First, it is surprising that the painting was exhibited at all, an event that D. G. Rossetti would probably have prevented if he could, and second, it was the earliest painting of D. G. Rossetti's we know to have gained Ruskin's admiration. The exhibition of this work perhaps indicates one of the reasons for Rossetti's antipathy to Gambart who clearly felt that ownership of the work sufficient justification to ignore the artist's wishes on exhibiting. D. G. Rossetti often refused permission for his works to be placed in public exhibitions and he frequently made it a condition of sale that such permission was sought. Beatrice, Meeting Dante at a Marriage Feast, Denies him her Salutation, while being unusually open to public view, was otherwise an early example of what was to become typical of D. G. Rossetti's work in the 1850s. W. M. Rossetti noted that the striking use of blue and green in the painting was perhaps the first essay by his brother into the use of this combination. It was the breadth of these colours that attracted Ruskin, and he thought, with the fragmentary gold, that it was 'a perfect feast'. Ruskin's admiration for the picture was expressed in a letter to Holman Hunt but his praise led to no other action on the writer's part.⁴³ At the time Ruskin was still strongly supporting Millais's career and work, but by early 1854 Millais and Effie Gray had formed an attachment. While there was no reason why Ruskin could not continue to praise the work of Millais, there was certainly no way that he could maintain close personal involvement in the artist's professional life. This intimate involvement with the production and success of an artist was something Ruskin clearly valued and an experience he pursued with some ardour. The almost passionate interest that flattered D. G. Rossetti in 1854 was lavished on Burne-Jones a few years later.

While D. G. Rossetti's early oil paintings had not impressed the great critic as much as the more adroit and impressive work of Millais, these watercolours clearly caught his interest. D. G. Rossetti had continued to develop the use of watercolour ostensibly to produce studies for oil paintings. (Beatrice, Meeting Dante at a Marriage Feast, Denies him her Salutation was described as such a study when it was exhibited at the Winter Exhibition.) Oils, of course, were the high status medium of the professional artist (neither should it be forgotten that watercolours were conventionally associated with the artistic adventures of the genteel amateur). In reality, it must be in doubt that D. G. Rossetti ever intended to base more ambitious work on these watercolours. Yet not to have such an intention did tend to suggest at least a lack of professional ambition if not outright dilettantism. In 1857 the Athenaeum wrote of D. G. Rossetti's Pre-Raphaelite exhibition entries that sketching was deceptive and dangerous, since it was the 'day dream of painting'.⁴⁴ One factor that suggests that D. G. Rossetti never intended to produce full-sized oils from these works is the number of figures involved and the picture's compositional complexity. D. G. Rossetti's ability to produce imaginative and skilful drawings is impressive when he does not feel himself bound by the lingering strictures of his early Pre-Raphaelite practice that produced the Girlhood of the Virgin Mary and The Annunciation. If we look at the unfinished Found (1854-81) (Plate 12), which was commissioned by McCracken and which D. G. Rossetti fully intended to be an oil painting, we quickly notice that the grace and confidence of the two watercolours is wanting.⁴⁵ D. G. Rossetti was at some pains to keep these early oil paintings at a manageable level of simplicity. Found contains only two figures and a calf. The kneeling woman and the man tugging at her hands are in a simple compositional

relationship that expresses little tension. The calf on the cart, symbolising perhaps the fate of innocence transported from the country, was realised in so much detail only because of the involvement of Ford Madox Brown. Brown arranged for the hire of both calf and cart and was obliged to provide D. G. Rossetti with board and lodging while he worked on studies of them. Never happy in representing nature directly or in the tedious and minute labour that 'selected nothing and neglected nothing', Rossetti was as yet not confident enough to abandon it. When D. G. Rossetti did find his own style and subject, the sumptuous paintings of women that are so typical of his work in the 1860s and 1870s, he also found collectors who showed great loyalty and great interest in his career.

George Rae began collecting D. G. Rossetti's work in 1862 when he purchased Mariana, a circular painting of a head that was first offered to Leathart. It is probably no coincidence that Rae and Leathart were friends. The years 1862 and 1863 see both men adding a number of Rossetti's paintings to their collections. In fact, Rae maintained a friendly rivalry with other collectors, especially a fellow resident of Birkenhead, Frederick Leyland. These relationships can be determined from Rae's correspondence with the critic, F. G. Stephens. Stephens, of course, had been one of the founding members of the PRB and was a close friend of D. G. Rossetti. The strands of self-interest that weave the artistic obsessions of D. G. Rossetti, Rae and Stephens together, provide us with a revealing picture of how a private professionalism might function. Unlike Millais, who despaired of the critics and placed his trust in a wide popular appeal, D. G. Rossetti tried to limit his audience to selected and sympathetic critics, or committed collectors. How, then, might a private relationship between a critic, a collector and an artist work? Among Stephens's papers in the Bodleian Library,

there is a series of letters and notes from D. G. Rossetti on Stephens's criticism of his painting. There was also an extensive correspondence between Stephens and George Rae, the prominent Birkenhead collector. This group of letters offers us the opportunity to witness the mutual dependence of these various aspects of the art world: production; evaluation; and consumption. In the case of both sets of letters—those of D. G. Rossetti and Rae—the most interesting are those that are either prompted by Stephens's criticism or aim to influence it. The earliest of this type of letter are those from D. G. Rossetti to Stephens, as might be expected, since both were founder members of the PRB.

D. G. Rossetti's first letters to Stephens tend to reflect their mutual interests as members of the PRB—meetings, exhibitions and sketching clubs. However, from the mid-1860s, the time when D. G. Rossetti's career was becoming firmly established, the artist's letters to the critic take on a much more programmatic quality. Dianne Sachko Macleod, in an article in the Burlington Magazine (1986), suggests that Stephens was 'cowed by D. G. Rossetti's forceful personality during the course of their friendship, [but] he abruptly changed his tune after the artist's death'.⁴⁶ While it is true that Stephens's praise for some of D. G. Rossetti's paintings was not as fulsome as it had been when he first reviewed them, such re-evaluation is to be expected—as, of course, is a greater freedom to express an opinion of an artist who can no longer dash off a letter of complaint. The extent to which Stephens was manipulated by D. G. Rossetti's intervention is difficult to gauge but certainly the extent of the artist's involvement in the critical process suggests that he must have felt it rewarding.

On the 21 October 1865 D. G. Rossetti wrote to Stephens to thank him for 'so full and friendly a description of my pictures'.⁴⁷ However, D. G. Rossetti went

on to take the critic to task for stating that the artist had 'lately to some extent resumed oil painting.' It was important to D. G. Rossetti that it should be understood that for some years he had been working 'chiefly in oils' and, indeed, except for two or three years in his youth had never 'wholly abandon[ed] it.' The reason for D. G. Rossetti's concern over this apparent misapprehension was his wish to receive as 'many commissions as possible for pictures in oil rather than watercolour.' It is clear that D. G. Rossetti's interest is far more practical than academic. His concern is not to ensure that all information contained in Stephens's article is correct but that it is presented in a way that is most professionally advantageous to the artist (oil painting enjoying greater status than watercolour, which was often seen as the preserve of the amateur). We should not suppose, however, that the result of what Macleod calls D. G. Rossetti's 'manipulation' was only of benefit to the artist himself. By enjoying the trust and friendship of an artist who, certainly in Pre-Raphaelite circles, was beginning to seem increasingly important, Stephens enjoyed access to work that few other critics had the opportunity to see.

Stephens received invitations from D. G. Rossetti to view work in progress because he felt the critic would be sympathetic to his wishes. It was in just that spirit that on the 15 November 1871 Rossetti wrote the following to Stephens:

I shall be glad to show you my picture, on the strict understanding that nothing is said about it in print unless you are able to write a separate article on it couched in the most decided tone. . . The picture is a serious effort surpassing, in scale and care, any former one of mine and professes to hold its own against any modern work whatever. . . Such a word, if found possible, I should be glad to hear of it: otherwise I

desire no word at all. . . We are too old friends to fear that either of us, in speaking should <seem> to doubt the other's good intentions towards him. I have absolutely no such doubt, either as to what you have written or may write: but I say that in my present position only the strongest outspokening is better for me than silence.⁴⁸ [Words that have been included <thus> I have not been able to certainly identify from the MS.]

As time went by, Rossetti clearly felt that he could make quite specific demands of Stephens's friendship. This was doubly true at a time — that of the 'fleshly controversy' that followed the publication of his Poems (1870) — when he believed that his work was attracting too much adverse criticism. We can also see that while in 1865 Rossetti had been concerned with immediate sales and profits he was now showing a greater concern with maintaining and extending his reputation as a serious painter. The letter is evidence of the methods Rossetti employed to ensure that those he considered his friends, especially those who were in a position to exert influence in his favour, should use that influence favourably. By limiting access to his paintings, wherever possible, to those over whose opinion he had some control, Rossetti was acting within the private sphere to manipulate public perception.

Macleod considers the relationship of Stephens and Rossetti 'unusual' and refers to Rossetti's behaviour as a 'blatant attempt' to control what was written of his work.⁴⁹ Stephens apparently 'meekly agreed' to the conditions that Rossetti demanded. Rossetti's involvement in Stephens's articles did not end with mere strictures. In 1875 he sent no less than six descriptions of his paintings, Proserpine and Astarte Syriaca among them. Stephens used Rossetti's descriptions in an

article in the Athenaeum in August of 1875. However, while Rossetti's involvement with Stephens's criticism was perhaps the most extensive it was not unique, nor was it the earliest. In November 1866 Brown sent Stephens a detailed description of one of his King Lear pictures, Cordelia's Portion, which he had 'written very carefully' to save Stephens the 'trouble of writing another'.⁵⁰ For a busy critic with deadlines to meet, such descriptions of paintings must have proved very helpful, and financially rewarding. Stephens was certainly gaining as much from his friendships within the Pre-Raphaelite circle as he was giving. All of his contacts, particularly W. M. Rossetti, provided him with tit-bits from the studio grapevine for his gossip column in the Athenaeum. This symbiotic relationship between artists and critics sharing common beliefs and ambitions is an important development in the growing professionalism of the artist and critic, and in the emergence of an avant-garde.

Indicative of the pressures exerted upon the changing climate of professionalism is D. G. Rossetti's growing awareness of the importance of primogeniture. This awareness is illustrated in a letter from around 1874, prompted by the appearance in a sale at Christie's of his Annunciation (1850). Rossetti wants the sale mentioned in Stephens's gossip column – providing that the picture got a good price – but also mentions that in 'point of time it [The Annunciation] is the ancestor of all the white pictures which have since become so numerous'.⁵¹ Among those 'white' pictures, of course, were those of Whistler. Rossetti's approach to criticism shows an acute professional awareness of the changing demands of the art market. Public opinion and wide popularity are certainly not important criteria, but, rather, it is the esoteric knowledge that informs the cognoscenti of precedence and pecking order that determines the

reputation of the serious artist. Such awareness of what was important in the world of modern art characterises the astute contemporary collector as well. Rae's correspondence with Stephens shows how such a collector's co-operative, if self-aggrandising, intervention could benefit both critic and artist.

Between 1873 and 1887, Stephens produced a series of articles in the Athenaeum on 'The Private Collections of England'. In this series Stephens showed as much favour to the modern collections of the newly-rich as he did to the 'old-masters' of the aristocracy. Soon after the articles began to appear in 1873, and following the review of Leathart's collection, Rae wrote to H. V. Tebbs (the editor of the Athenaeum) to praise the magazine on the series.⁵² Rae had been visiting Leathart in Newcastle when the article was published and now hoped 'that the accomplished writer would do for Liverpool and Birkenhead what he had done for Newcastle and Gateshead.' The letter, which was passed on to Stephens, goes on to offer hospitality to the writer to provide him with the opportunity to view Rae's collection. While Rae included a catalogue of his paintings, it is significant that those he mentioned in his letter were all produced by Rossetti and seem, like Fazio's Mistress, to be examples of the artist's sensual representations of women. In due course, Stephens visited Rae in Birkenhead and produced an article which the collector thought 'vivid and explanative'.⁵³

It was, however, a letter written on the occasion of D. G. Rossetti's death that shows the full extent of the involvement of the collector and critic in the interests of the artist. On the 11 April 1882, Rae wrote to Stephens to communicate his shock 'to hear of the death of our dear friend Rossetti, . . . for I had not heard even that he was ill'.⁵⁴ This letter, although prompted by friendly

regard for the memory of Rossetti, also promotes the interest of the collector, Rae goes on to say:

I have comfort in reflecting that I was one of the few who recognised [his genius] from the first. Some of the samples of his work here, I find, date as far back as 1857. I am proud to think that I am the possessor of probably the largest collection of his works, in number, anywhere. I have 20 in all, of which 7 are more or less important examples. (The Beloved; Palmifera; Mona Verna; The Damosel of the Sanct Grail; Fazzio's sic Mistress; and Venus Verticordia.) Next in number to mine is Mr Leyland's collection, but it is thicker in more important works, and Liverpool owns 'Dante's Dream'.

I think it would only be fair that these facts should be recognised in any obituary notice in the 'Athenaeum', which has so ably vindicated the genius of . . . Rossetti against all comers, if it were merely to show the Londoners that we are not the <Goths> hereabouts which some of them appear inclined to think.

Rae's expectation was fulfilled and he was duly mentioned by Stephens in the Athenaeum. What is clear from Rae's letter is that he felt himself to be involved in a partnership that had several significant characteristics. Rae was proud of his early recognition of Rossetti's importance, especially as the artist was controversial. The collector also identifies the Athenaeum, but more realistically, Stephens, as an ally in the defence of Rossetti and thus as a partner in his early recognition. The extent of Rae's commitment is indicated by the size and importance of his collection, a fact he wants noticed. Finally, Rae's 'Rossetti's' are

a symbol of modernity, and with Leyland's collection they indicate to London that those in Liverpool are not 'Goths'.

In a further letter written three days later, Rae thanks Stephens for noticing his collection in Rossetti's obituary.⁵⁵ In the course of that short time, Rae and Leyland had been concerned to organise a major retrospective exhibition, preferably at the Royal Academy, to ensure Rossetti's reputation continued to grow. Both collectors feared that 'amateur' exhibitors will attempt to put on 'scratch collections of pot-boilers', leaving their more prestigious offerings 'prejudiced and damned' before they are even shown. To prevent inadequate shows, Rae is at pains to gain Stephens's help in publicising the project to deter those who could only offer less. The communications that Rae sent to Stephens indicate the important role that both critic and collector played in supporting and enlarging Rossetti's reputation. In return, it is clear that both critic and collector gained from their association with Rossetti. Rae is assured not only of his modernity, but that he is recognised in the Capital – a fact he wishes his neighbours to know. Later in 1882, Rae wrote to Stephens to ask if the critic would 'mention the fact that my collection was described at such and such a date in the Athenaeum, because many of my Liverpool friends are still ignorant of the fact'.⁵⁶ Stephens, who, unlike Ruskin and W. M. Rossetti, gained his whole income from writing, received valuable information and exclusivity from Rossetti, and generous hospitality from collectors. Rossetti's private approach to critics and patrons, then, proved eminently successful and offered material benefits to all concerned. Yet a marked distinction between Rossetti's limited and personal arena and that of Millais, was that it did not appear to offer the institutional and State approval that Millais acquired in his lifetime. Naturally, the memorial exhibition

at the Royal Academy that followed Rossetti's death was an admission of the artist's national eminence. Such considerations lead me to examine how such retrospective honour can operate to the advantage of the artist while living, and why it promotes the status of the professional ideal over mere commercial and popular success.

VI

D. G. Rossetti had avoided first the Royal Academy and then all public exhibition, but we should not suppose from his avoidance of its annual exhibition that he despised the Academy as a professional institution. His letters show that he visited each year's exhibition and commented freely on works he saw there. Certainly in the 1850s the Academy was considered to offer the surest way to professional success. Doughty points out that in private Rossetti deplored his 'early abstention from exhibition', but Doughty maintains that this was a pretence. While Rossetti asserted that he thought 'competition and appreciation . . . among an artist's best privileges,' he nevertheless continued to avoid public experience of them whenever possible. The reason he gave for adhering to his 'plan of non-exhibition' was that having adopted a 'plan for life' it was best not to waste time in 'giving second thoughts to it'.⁵⁷ But mere exhibition of an artist's works in the Royal Academy was not sufficient to establish his or her career, since it was membership that offered the necessary status. Holman Hunt ceased to put himself forward for election after repeated rejection because he feared that this would damage his growing reputation.

Pre-Raphaelitism had soon become identified as the anti-Academic school and, we may suppose, gained rather than lost status in certain quarters because of this identification. So much was the Royal Academy seen to represent interests

opposed to Pre-Raphaelitism that Burne-Jones, when eventually persuaded to become an Associate, resigned within a year. Burne-Jones's resignation did not prevent him from receiving a knighthood and like symbols of professional success. The Academy had become synonymous with unprogressive art, and progressive art could manage quite well without the Academy. However, the Pre-Raphaelites and later Aesthetes were only able to achieve both a living and eventual status because of the emergence of alternative professional strategies. The most important of these were dealers, critics, and specialist private galleries and exhibitions that enjoyed high status. The critics reinforced the importance of Pre-Raphaelitism and maintained the idea of its modernity while the dealers promoted the more popular works like The Light of the World. For a time the Grosvenor Gallery enjoyed high status as a modern alternative to the Royal Academy, but it was not the shape of the future. One-man shows and small galleries were the showplaces that modern art would favour and the relatively small and brilliant Pre-Raphaelite paintings, not to mention the cult of personality that was generated by periodical debate, were very suited to more intimate surroundings.

By his example, Rossetti proved that an important reputation and professional respect could be achieved and maintained without recourse to the Academy or to public exhibition. In many ways, Rossetti's reputation was safer than Millais's. While Millais was judged each year on his production of that year, which was discussed, measured and pronounced upon, Rossetti's reputation grew cumulatively in the mouths and minds of a growing number of patrons and professional friends. Rossetti's success was one constituted by judgements made – not by the open market but, in Perkin's words – by 'similarly educated

experts.' Millais's success was increasingly one based on the popularity of his work, whereas Rossetti's relied upon an idea that valued the artist as a uniquely creative individual. The art world was dividing into two under the competing pressures of the conflicting entrepreneurial and professional ideals. On one side, the fine art print was giving way to the popular image. A colour reproduction of Millais's Cherry Ripe (1879) was given away in a magazine, and Bubbles (1886) became a soap salesman. This was a kind of success that the entrepreneurial ideal could understand. At the end of his career, Millais declared to Hunt:

a painter must work for the taste of his own day. . . I want proof that the people of my day enjoy my work, and how can I get this better than by finding people willing to give me money for my productions, and that I win honours from contemporaries?⁵⁸

As we have seen, this attitude was in marked contrast to his feelings in 1859. On the other side, there was an increasing tendency to exclusivity. There was a 'cultivated minority' who, according to the press, only valued art that was 'above the run of everyday taste'.⁵⁹ To such cognoscenti, a wide popularity was in itself proof of a lack of refinement.

In an article on the Fine Art Quarterly Review, Julie F. Codell explores the conflict between popular art and 'quality' art.⁶⁰ Although her essay discusses the debate in terms of 'artpolitics' there is little doubt that the issues involved are those arising from the dichotomy between the entrepreneurial and professional ideals. It is significant that among the periodical's contributors are W. M. Rossetti, F. G. Stephens, F. T. Palgrave and P. G. Hamerton, all associated with either Pre-Raphaelitism or the debate on professionalism; in some cases both. Codell asserts that the 'FAQ' stressed its commitment to art history, rather

unusual considering that such a discipline did not exist in any English university'.⁶¹ In its reviews and articles the Fine Arts Quarterly promoted a rigorous and academic approach to art criticism that is clearly in keeping with the emerging professional ideal. The magazine called for the public employment of young artists — that is more involvement from government rather than less — in the face of a speculative market. The Fine Arts Quarterly believed that this market affected the aesthetic quality of art. It discussed the role of the dealer, the 'chief channel between the supply and demand of the industrial picture market'.⁶² The use of the word 'industrial' is telling. The dealer is associated with the industrialist to whom he sells art, not only as an agency of sale but in his very approach to the production of art. Industrial art was the antithesis of aesthetic art. W. M. Rossetti made the distinction clear when reviewing Burne-Jones: the true artist was an inventor who placed on his paintings the 'stamp of one personal individualism'. This distinction was central to the development of a definition of the professional artist. As Codell says, this distinction was not only dependent on how a living was earned but 'joined economic and aesthetic systems'.⁶³

Central to the debate on professionalism was the belief expressed by Palgrave:

Art, like poetry, is addressed to the world at large, not to a special jury of professional masters; the technical qualities are only a means to a public end [which is to attain] high and enduring pleasure.⁶⁴

The success of the professional ideal is that it overturns the judgement of an ignorant public. Codell sites the crucial debate on professionalism in the 1890s and 1900s but we should note that as early as 1866 W. M. Rossetti is maintaining the need for professional expertise. In a reply to a review by W. F. Rae that

attacked the jargon of art professionals, W. M. Rossetti, while he is in agreement in principle with Rae, suspects 'that the only criticism of much use in the long run is that by professional men'.⁶⁵ W. M. Rossetti believed that the 'art country' was in a state of war and that sides had to be chosen. The sides in this war were those inherent in the two conflicting ideals of the entrepreneur and the professional. Through the 1860s and 70s it must have seemed, to draw on Matthew Arnold's term, that if the 'Philistines' could not become 'cultured', culture was bound to become 'Philistine'. On the other side an elitist art was coming into being that conformed to the needs of the professional ideal. Entry to the ranks of this elite was to become as prescribed as that to any professional organisation and the 'ultimate guarantor' of its professional status was the state. For the professional artist, this ultimate guarantee took the form of national and civic art collections and a state apparatus for buying the works of living artists.

In February 1857 W. M. Rossetti and Ruskin, in company with other members of the Rossetti circle, met to organise the funding with which to buy a Pre-Raphaelite painting. The painting was Jerusalem with the Valley of Jehoshaphat by Thomas Seddon (Plate 13). Seddon had travelled to the Holy Land with Holman Hunt where this painting was largely produced in the summer and autumn of 1854. Although he came back to England with Hunt the unfortunate Seddon had then returned to Egypt in 1856 and contracted dysentery from which he died on 23 November that year.⁶⁶ Jerusalem with the Valley of Jehoshaphat is arguably the most authoritative Pre-Raphaelite landscape. The painting, which depicts Jerusalem overlooking the valley, makes no concessions to the academic conventions of landscape painting. The viewer looks at once down a hill to a young shepherd and his sheep and across the valley to distant hills that are

undimmed by any artificial addition of aerial perspective. The harsh light of an arid country is depicted with an honesty that results in a painting whose pictorial depth is reduced to that of a patchwork quilt. Even the limited form that Jerusalem with the Valley of Jehoshaphat attains is apparently greater than Seddon first intended. The painting, exhibited in its finished form, was the result of considerable reworking with the assistance and advice of Hunt after both he and Brown had criticised the effects achieved in the original depiction. This painting, more than any other Pre-Raphaelite work, gives the modern eye the chance to appreciate the degree of flatness about which contemporary critics complained in early Pre-Raphaelite works. It was not, however, the exemplary Pre-Raphaelitism of the painting that prompted the purchase of Seddon's work by his friends. The intended end of the proposed purchase of this painting was to present it to the National Gallery.⁶⁷ A memorial exhibition displaying the greater part of Seddon's modest oeuvre was held at the Society of Arts in May of 1857, and in due course the painting was accepted by the National Gallery.

While Seddon was not the first Pre-Raphaelite to die (Walter Howell Deverell passed away in 1854 of Bright's Disease), he was the first with any significant work to his name. Seddon had exhibited regularly at the Royal Academy during the six years before his death but, perhaps because of his Pre-Raphaelite status, was not an Associate. It is perhaps significant that Jerusalem with the Valley of Jehoshaphat, which was to be the first Pre-Raphaelite painting to enter a public collection, had not been exhibited at the Royal Academy. The lack of Academic approval was not considered a setback. But what of the motives of the Rossettis and Ruskin? Although this painting was certainly Seddon's most important work it was far from being the most significant Pre-Raphaelite painting

to this date. Why, then, was there such interest in placing it in the National Gallery? The principal motive that comes to mind, of course, is that it served as a memorial to a gifted young artist. However, the National Gallery in accepting the work was placing an official seal of approval, not on the life of an obscure painter, but on the Pre-Raphaelite movement as a whole.

The significance of the acceptance of this gift cannot have been lost on the Trustees of the gallery. There is little doubt that Ruskin's role as treasurer to the subscribing group was influential in gaining the painting's acceptance. It should be remembered that, as executor of Turner's bequest, Ruskin would have developed a certain familiarity with the trustees and their procedures. Whatever the motive for the offer and subsequent acceptance of the painting, the implication is clear: Thomas Seddon, although not an RA, was, nevertheless a significant practitioner of his profession. The authority that lent him that significance was Pre-Raphaelitism. The prestige of Pre-Raphaelitism, which had originally only maintained its standing with the support of its own practitioners and a number of admittedly eminent critics was now underwritten by the state.

Ruskin, W. M. Rossetti and the Rossetti circle, while ensuring that one of their number would be remembered, had by so doing established official status for a painter associated with their group. From the moment that Jerusalem with the Valley of Jehoshaphat was placed in the National Gallery, there was little doubt that other better known Pre-Raphaelite paintings were almost sure to follow. The state's recognition of Pre-Raphaelitism would clearly influence the attitude of prospective purchasers of such paintings. Especially influenced would be those collectors who hoped that their personal taste might at some time form the basis for a public collection. It must be seen as significant that from 1857 there

is a clear expansion in the number and importance of the collectors who buy the work of Rossetti and other Pre-Raphaelites. A number of these like George Rae of Liverpool and James Leathart of Newcastle were involved in the development of provincial civic galleries. Henry Tate made sure to acquire a number of important Pre-Raphaelite works for the collection he donated for a national gallery of British art.⁶⁸

The spread of state art collections, both in London and the provinces, increasingly offered possible sites for a modern artist to establish a professional reputation independently of that guaranteed by the Royal Academy. The industrial cities of the North and Midlands sought to establish their cultural identities by building art galleries and were often the keenest supporters of Pre-Raphaelitism. Yet it is clear that this tendency alone was neither sufficient to support Rossetti's reputation nor adequate enough to provide him with the income he required. To be ensured of a comfortable middle-class income, he had to depend on selling work and on that work steadily increasing in value. It is evident both from D. G. Rossetti's letters and W. M. Rossetti's remarks that the volume and value of the artist's work did indeed grow. D. G. Rossetti shared with Millais the advantages of the growing activities of art dealers, although these were still treated with caution by many artists, and the support of fellow professionals. The support that Rossetti enjoyed from Ruskin and fellow Pre-Raphaelites may superficially appear to parallel the preceding system. The patronage of old society and the institutionalised support of the profession that the Royal Academy represented, however, differ from this later support more than in just degree. While Ruskin bought Rossetti's paintings and promoted his career, he did so, not in the spirit of the obligations carried by the wealthy to help

those who came into their sphere of influence, but from a more specific professional obligation to promote that which he considered worthwhile. The buyers that he influenced in Rossetti's favour were acting from a belief in Ruskin's professional judgement rather than in support of any systematic exchange of personal influence.

VII

Although Pre-Raphaelitism begins as the result of an apparent unity of aims and ideas, that unity proved to be an illusion. The PRB was formed in part to oppose an obsolete professional practice that was validated and orchestrated by the Royal Academy. The Brotherhood's opposition was initially perceived in aesthetic and technical terms but it soon extended into other areas of professional activity. Central to these was the near monopoly that the Royal Academy enjoyed in the sphere of the significant professional artist. Both Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Millais managed to manufacture viable careers – one entirely outside the Academy and one in spite of opposition from influential Academicians. The success of each of these artists demonstrates the ascendancy of middle-class ideology, as does the development of Pre-Raphaelitism itself. However, it is clear that the ideological superstructure of the middle classes was far from homogeneous. In 1848, the middle-class ideal appeared to consist of a belief in free trade and progress that was supported by the intellectual and professional fraction of that class. Yet, as entrepreneurial society increasingly proved itself to be incapable of improving the welfare of all its citizens without the regulatory impositions of an outside agency, an alternative ideal began to emerge. But the professional ideal did not enjoy economic dominance of the state it wished to

regulate. The eventual hegemony of professional society was attained because it established a moral authority that was ultimately underwritten by the state.

The role of the artist is a complex one within what might be seen as the abandonment of moral authority by the class fraction that owned the means of production. Through the transfer of critical evaluation of art from the professional artist to the professional critic, the emphasis of debate moved from the skill of the artist to the vision of the artist. In this context, the value placed on the artist's vision rather than his technical skill constitutes the currency of discrimination that identifies Ruskin's 'master'. The technical debate becomes one internal to the profession of artist. While professional artists and critics might use technical considerations in electing their 'masters', the general public is left to accept the status of the artist as one arrived at by experts. Although that public might expect the professional critic to be aware of the technical debate the public do not primarily look for that debate to be interpreted. What is more important is that the artist is evaluated and 'certified' by the critic's professional authority. The foundation for the critic's authority and, ultimately, for the artist's vision, is the state. The development of national and local art collections during the nineteenth century established the machinery to provide the artist and critic with the means to legitimise their credentials. The Royal Academy never enjoyed this power. Although it was an establishment concerned with the status and position of the artist, it was too clearly concerned with the sale of art. All of which brings us to the question of the artist and 'trade'.

The debate on professionalism may have appeared to those involved such as Rossetti and Spielmann as a conflict between gentility and trade, but this was not the case. The conflict was resolved not by according the artist and trade

gentility but by establishing the status of the artist as apart from the commercial trade in paintings. Such a separation was achieved by the development of two other professional groups, the critics and the dealers. By placing the evaluation of the work of the artist in the hands of the one, and the sale of his work in the hands of the other, the artist is isolated from the mundane concerns of the market. In other words, the artist is ultimately granted gentility by professional society, not in spite of his calling but because of it. In his isolation from the material aspects of his trade and the rarity value of his self-property the artist stands as an example of professionalism in its purest form. But the artist plays a further role in the establishment of professional society beyond that of justification of the rent value of a rare skill. In the form of Pre-Raphaelitism, the artist played a part in establishing the nature of a specific ideal of the professional gentleman—one that could be understood finally only in terms of gender and sexuality. The Pre-Raphaelite involvement in the debate on gentility and ideas of masculinity, femininity and sexuality will be explored in the next chapter.

Notes to Chapter Four

¹ Oswald Doughty, A Victorian Romantic-Dante Gabriel Rossetti (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), 218.

² Ibid., 218.

³ Ibid., 322.

⁴ Harold Perkin, preface to The Rise of Professional Society (London: Routledge, 1989), xiii.

⁵ Percy Bate, The English Pre-Raphaelite Painters [1899] (reprint London: George Bell, 1902), 8. See also John Guille Millais, The Life and Letters of John Everett Millais, PRA, 2 vols (London: Methuen, 1899), 1:55.

⁶ J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:147.

⁷ Doughty, A Victorian Romantic, 413.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 678.

⁹ Julie F. Codell, 'Marion Harry Spielmann and the Role of the Press in the Professionalization of Artists', Victorian Periodical Review, 22:1 (1989), 7–15.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹² *Ibid.*, 10. Codell cites Spielmann, Graphic v. 58 (24 Sept. 1898), 426.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹⁴ Perkin, The Rise of Professional Society, xiii.

¹⁵ Codell, 'Marion Harry Spielmann,' 14.

¹⁶ John Ruskin, Pre-Raphaelitism (undated), 246.

¹⁷ J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:341.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1:340.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 1:343.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1:340-1.

²¹ Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites, 176. The sale of the painting is also referred to in a letter, Millais to Effie Millais, 17 May 1859, in J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:348.

²² J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:343.

²³ *Ibid.*, 1:344.

²⁴ William Michael Rossetti, Fine Art, Chiefly Contemporary: Notices Reprinted, with Revisions, [1867] (reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1970), 223.

²⁵ J. G. Millais, Millais, 1:344.

²⁶ Ibid., 1:345.

²⁷ Kristen Garrigan, 'Bearding the Competition: John Ruskin's Academy Notes', Victorian Periodical Review, 23:4 (1987), 148-56 and Patricia Neal, 'John Ruskin as Paradigm, the Creator of the Modern Signed Art Review', (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1986).

²⁸ Garrigan, 'Bearding the Competition', 152-53.

²⁹ Ruskin, Pre-Raphaelitism, 328.

³⁰ Ibid., 332.

³¹ P.G. Hamerton, Thoughts About Art, [1873] (London: Macmillan, 1889), 153.

³² These are Hamerton's qualifications for art critics:

- 1) To utter unpopular truths, 2) To Instruct the public in the theoretical knowledge of art, 3) To defend true living artists against the malice of the ignorant, 4) To prevent false living artists from acquiring an influence injurious to the general interests of art, 5) To exalt the fame of dead artists whose example may be beneficial, 6) to weaken the fame of dead artists whose names have an injurious degree of authority, 7) To speak always with absolute sincerity, 8) To give open expression to vicissitudes of opinion, not fearing the imputation of inconsistency, 9) To make himself as thoroughly informed as his time and opportunities will allow about everything concerning the Fine Arts, whether directly or indirectly, 10) To enlarge his

own powers of sympathy, 11) To resist the formation of prejudices. Ibid., 152-61.

³³ William Michael Rossetti, Dante Gabriel Rossetti as Designer and Writer (London: Cassell, 1889), x.

³⁴ W. M. Rossetti, Fine Art, xiv.

³⁵ Ibid., xiv.

³⁶ W. M. Rossetti, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, x-xi.

³⁷ W. M. Rossetti, Fine Art, xiv.

³⁸ W. M. Rossetti, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, ix.

³⁹ Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Ford Madox Brown, 12 January 1861, cited in William Michael Rossetti, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, 39.

⁴⁰ William Michael Rossetti, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, 45-6.

⁴¹ Ibid., 21.

⁴² This is presumably The First Anniversary of the Death of Beatrice, a watercolour, 16 1/2 x 24 inches. The painting can be seen illustrated in Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites (London: Tate Gallery, 1984), no. 197.

⁴³ Ibid., 254-5.

⁴⁴ [Walter Thornbury? see note 68, Chapter Three], 'Fine-Art Gossip', Athenaeum (11 July 1857), 886.

⁴⁵ Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites, Item no. 196.

⁴⁶ Dianne Sachko Macleod, 'F. G. Stephens, Pre-Raphaelite critic and art historian', Burlington Magazine 128 (June 1986), 399.

⁴⁷ F. G. Stephens Papers, The Bodleian Library, Oxford, MSS DON.e.75:53.

⁴⁸ Stephens Papers, Bodleian, MSS DON.e.75:85.

-
- ⁴⁹ Macleod, 'F. G. Stephens, Pre-Raphaelite Critic and Art Historian', 399.
- ⁵⁰ Stephens Papers, Bodleian, MSS DON.e.61:20.
- ⁵¹ Stephens Papers, Bodleian, MSS DON.e.75:97.
- ⁵² Stephens Papers, Bodleian, MSS.DON.e.74:1.
- ⁵³ George Rae to F. G. Stephens, 11 October 1875, Bodleian.
- ⁵⁴ Stephens Papers, Bodleian, MSS.DON.e.74:7.
- ⁵⁵ George Rae to F. G. Stephens, 15 April 1882, Bodleian.
- ⁵⁶ George Rae to F. G. Stephens, 28 August 1882, Bodleian
- ⁵⁷ Doughty, A Victorian Romantic, 336.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., 678.
- ⁵⁹ Barrie Bullen, 'The Palace of Art', Apollo, 102:165-6 (1975), 354.
- ⁶⁰ Julie F. Codell, 'The Fine Arts Quarterly Review and Artpolitics in the 1860s', Victorian Periodical Review, 23:3 (1990), 91 – 97.
- ⁶¹ Ibid., 91.
- ⁶² Ibid., 92.
- ⁶³ Ibid., 95.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid., 95.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid., 95.
- ⁶⁶ Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites, 152-3.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid., 151-3. The matter is also mentioned in a letter from Ruskin to William Michael Rossetti 4 February 1857 which is reprinted in William Michael Rossetti, Ruskin: Rossetti: PreRaphaelitism, Papers 1854 to 1862 [1899] (reprint New York: AMS Press, 1971), 158.

⁶⁸ The list of Millais's paintings at the back of the second volume of J. G. Millais, Millais, 2:466–486, indicates the original buyers and the location of the paintings in 1899.

5 Professionalism and the Flesh

'For Rossetti,' Walter Pater writes in 1889, 'the great affections of persons to each other, swayed and determined, in the case of his highly pictorial genius, mainly by that so-called material loveliness, formed the great undeniable reality in things, the solid resisting substance, in a world where all beside might be but shadow.'¹ Pater was the first theoretician of Aestheticism and in his appreciation of the artist we can perceive the role that Rossetti played in producing an alternative of beauty and sensuality for a new generation of professional artists and writers. The 'aesthetic' alternative, which Pater explores in 'Aesthetic Poetry', is a Hellenism passionately intensified by the traditions of the medieval Romance, and by Romanticism itself.² Images that inherently 'remembered' a tradition of male and female seduction, told of love that transcended the bonds of marriage, and hinted at same-sex passion were fundamentally opposed to the values of middle-class mid-Victorian England. In this chapter, I will show that this opposition to the morality that sanctified home, wife, and the patriarch who ruled them served the class interests of the professional fraction of the middle class. What was increasingly perceived as the (ef)feminization of the artistic sphere by critics supporting the patriarchal tradition provided a foundation on which to build a critique of the moral ideology of the entrepreneurial middle class. This was an ideology based on the separation of male and female spheres of activity and influence, the sanctity of marriage, the absolute purity of the 'good' woman, and the utter degradation of her 'bad' fallen sister. It was increasingly the case

that Aesthetic artists who, like Rossetti, were involved in what Pater calls the 'great undeniable reality in things,' questioned that tradition of absolute separation. In doubting the middle-class construct of the 'good' woman, we will see that Rossetti proposed a reality that was unreconcilable with the underlying 'truths' of the entrepreneurial middle class.

In the winter of 1868–9, Rossetti completed the painting which he called Lady Lilith (Plates 14 & 15). It is one of a number of paintings heavily influenced by Titian and the Venetian Renaissance beginning in 1863 with Fazio's Mistress. Rossetti was still producing such paintings in 1873 when he completed La Ghilandata, but from that date onwards his paintings of women increasingly draw on Jane Morris as a model and, while losing none of their sensuality, take on a more monumental character. For more than a decade, Rossetti followed a programme of production that in its representation of desirable women examines middle-class male identity and its relationship to representations of sexuality. What, then, can such paintings tell us about the artist's relationship to the professional ideal and the function of sexuality, or the flesh, within that ideal? Rossetti produced Lady Lilith when he was at the height of his profession— influential, supported by respectful friends and fellow artists, and well-paid for his work. Moreover, paintings such as Lady Lilith, with their evident sensuality, have helped to identify Rossetti as a certain kind of professional artist—one involved in the construction of a middle-class masculinity—and have attracted a great deal of critical attention, especially from feminist art historians. It is now commonplace to read such paintings as Lady Lilith in terms of misogyny, reifying iconization, and the objectification of women's bodies. Not surprisingly, gender-specific readings of Rossetti's work have identified them with a dominant

patriarchal ideology.³ Feminist interpretations, in their turn, have been imposed on a long tradition of iconographic readings that are concerned with what fleshliness represents. What feminist and cultural criticism has failed to address until now is sexuality itself as subject-matter and its relationship to male middle-class professionalism. Rossetti's own images of sexually imposing femininity are particularly charged with questions of professionalism and sexuality, not least because of his preoccupation with the idea of the artist as whore. Ironically, it may be that the artist's willingness to adopt a feminized identity defines the relationship of the professional to entrepreneurial society. So it is from the professional conjunction of artist and whore in Lady Lilith that this chapter will begin to explore aspects of male professionalism and the flesh.

I

Lilith, made from the same handful of clay as Adam, has been associated with witchcraft, baby-stealing, and Eden's serpent. The sexual congress of Lilith and Adam was said to produce only demons.⁴ Lilith lacked a soul and it was a purely external 'body's beauty' that Rossetti associated with her.⁵ So Lilith is a dangerous and soulless woman – but what does she represent? In an essay published in 1984, Virginia M. Allen argues that Lilith refused to subjugate her own will to Adam's and so 'represents the New Woman, free of male control, scourge of the patriarchal Victorian family.'⁶ Allen maintains that the widely held belief that Rossetti represented his 'neurotic obsession' with dangerous female sexuality is part of the myth generated by the artist and his apologists. Indeed, she argues that Rossetti's paintings of women are 'as much in response to the psychological needs of the artist's audience as to his own.'⁷ Allen associates Lilith with middle-class male perceptions of the 'modern' woman's growing interest in birth control.

The aspect of the legend of Lilith which spoke of stealing – and perhaps killing – of babies is said to generate dark fears of abortion. Allen suggests that Rossetti was drawn to such 'New Women'. In fact, Lizzie Siddal was considered a 'New Woman', and described as such by William Rossetti, while Ruskin named her 'Ida' after the feminist Princess in Tennyson's poem The Princess (1847). While both of these gentlemen may indeed have considered Siddal a New Woman, we must take care not to confuse this label with that coined in 'the early 1890s [by] the "fiction of sex and the new woman" [which] caused something of a sensation'.⁸

It would seem likely, however, that the Pre-Raphaelite circle were aware of emerging alternative femininities and, indeed, that Rossetti's images became increasingly associated with these and with the almost mythical sexually active New Woman of the 1890s. To avoid confusion, I will refer to Allen's alternative term, the 'modern' woman. Lilith, then, represented the attitude of middle-class masculinity to the 'modern' woman, fascinated by her sexuality but fearful of her freedom to act outside the home and against the 'family'. Allen's reading, of course, supposes that the ideology of the male middle class is monolithically founded within patriarchy – which the 'modern' woman threatens. The problem with Allen's reading is that such images as Lady Lilith supposedly 'serve' patriarchy by representing the 'dangerous' or 'modern' women. In fact, at least part of Rossetti's audience found in these images a sexually attractive new paradigm of femininity. This audience comprised a limited, and specialised, professional fraction of the middle class.

Rossetti provided models of femininity that 'professional' men could compare with their experience of 'modern' women, and 'advanced' members of professional society did just that. The poet W. B. Yeats maintained that until his

twenty-sixth year (1891) he was in 'all things a Pre-Raphaelite'.⁹ Yeats had spent some of his childhood and youth on the Bedford Park Estate, a 'Pre-Raphaelite' suburb designed in the 1870s by Norman Shaw. The paradigms of femininity that Yeats and his fellow members of the Rhymers' Club held in the 1890s were those provided by Rossetti. Yeats wrote in his autobiography (which, although begun in 1915, was posthumously published in 1955):

Woman herself was still in our eyes, . . . romantic and mysterious, still the priestess of her shrine, our emotions remembering the Lilith and Sybylla Palmifera of Rossetti; for as yet that sense of comedy which was soon to mould the very fashion-plates, and, in the eyes of men of my generation, to destroy at last the sense of beauty itself, had scarce begun to show here and there, in slight subordinate touches, among the designs of great painters and craftsmen.¹⁰

What Yeats perceives as the loss of a 'sense of beauty' is indicative of the iconic influence of Rossetti and Pre-Raphaelitism on advertisements, fashion plates, and the cinema. Here Yeats has identified an important characteristic of the relationships between the avant-garde, professional society and the bourgeoisie. The consumption and critical analysis of avant-garde production by the professional class are assimilated and commercialised by the entrepreneurial ideal—often by eliminating the dangerous sexuality to replace it with a sanitised sex appeal (the 'angel in the house' wearing a bathing suit). Thus, to maintain its critical position in relationship to the bourgeoisie, the avant-garde must pursue a strategy of innovation and in so doing provide the means for the professional ideal to maintain an intellectual (and moral) separation from the Philistines. What

is significant about Rossetti's fleshly paintings and poems is that they point to an important site of modernist praxis – sexuality.

It is for this reason that Allen's reading of Lady Lilith becomes problematical as it does not recognise a masculine position emerging with the professional ideal which can serve as a platform for a critique of patriarchy. Was Rossetti, as Allen claims, 'anti-feminist'? She contends that the suffragists of Manchester in 1913 certainly believed so, as they threw rocks at Astarte Syriaca. Unfortunately, such activities no more indicate 'anti-feminism' in Rossetti than they did in Velazquez. Instead, what they certainly indicate are the perceptions of the feminist protesters. Although Allen recognises Rossetti's encouragement of 'Elizabeth Siddal's artistic efforts', as well as his promotion of her friendship with Barbara Bodichon, a champion of women's rights, she finds it unlikely that he believed in the liberation of women. Her evidence for this belief is Rossetti's adoration for his mother, a 'staunchly conservative woman', and his advice to his sister Christina 'against "falsetto masculinity"' in a controversial poem.¹¹ I do not find this evidence convincing. What would it mean, for instance, if Rossetti did not adore his mother? Would his advice to Christina Rossetti not be just as fitting if he were a feminist? One might think it far better for Christina Rossetti to have a real woman's voice than that of an artificial man. That said, what Allen's discussion of Lady Lilith usefully exposes are the contradictions in Rossetti's representations of femininity – that they seem to attack the morality of the patriarchal middle class while serving to help define middle-class masculinity. These are contradictions which provide sufficient reason for past and present controversy. Rossetti's work has further become a site of contention, both to his contemporaries and to the modern feminist critic, partly because of the

seductiveness of the images themselves. When Lynne Pearce speaks of exposing the 'sexism, misogyny and pornography' of Pre-Raphaelite images, she admits that part of her disapproval of such paintings is due to their appeal to an untutored sensibility.¹²

It is in the early 1860s that Dante Gabriel Rossetti's paintings of "'fleshly", narcissistic women' begin to take on a programmatic quality. They begin, interestingly, with an illustration for the frontispiece of Christina Rossetti's Goblin Market in 1862 and, in the words of the Tate Gallery catalogue, 'reach a climax in the painting' of Lady Lilith; the model for both was Fanny Cornforth.¹³ Earlier Pre-Raphaelite representations of sensual women (as in Millais's Mariana and Holman Hunt's Awakening Conscience) were mediated by their literary and moralistic contexts in a way that seems absent from Rossetti's more mythic paintings. His choice of subjects, which later included Medea and Proserpine as well as Lilith, were sensual women who were dangerous as well as desirable. These were women who, rather than being victims of men and their own sensuality, revived ancient mythological fears of a rapacious and vengeful femininity. Clearly, in devoting himself to these particular images/icons of femininity, Rossetti is working counter to the ideal of middle-class womanhood, the 'Angel in the House'. Nor should we assume that Rossetti is negotiating for patriarchy by representing the dyadic 'other' of the angel, the prostitute. As Kimberley Reynolds and Nicola Humble have pointed out, insisting that all Victorian representations of women adhere to the strict polarity of pure and sexually continent or impure and sexually rapacious is both unhelpful and an over-simplification. In Victorian Heroines (1993), Reynolds and Humble make the

point that representations of femininity in Victorian art and literature cannot always be classified as repressive or misogynistic:

even a cursory survey of depictions of women in the last century can hardly fail to call this highly polarised way of constructing femininity into question, and in the process reveal much that is strong, powerful, and affirmative in Victorian representations of women by writers and artists of both sexes.¹⁴

The sphere of a Medea or Lilith is far from the domestic hearth and the artist makes no attempt to return her there. Whereas, for example, in The Awakening Conscience, Hunt used a detailed iconography to construct a 'truth' that, in this case, worked within the ideology of middle-class marriage and the 'natural' virtue of women when uncorrupted by the shallow worldly trappings of the newly rich, Rossetti glamorises women and surrounds them with symbols of death or divinity. In the painting Astarte Syriaca (1875–7), Rossetti represents Jane Morris as an Eastern goddess of love whose 'twofold girdle clasps the infinite boon/Of bliss whereof Heaven and Earth commune' (Plate 16).¹⁵ Far from reminding Mrs Morris of her proper sphere, Rossetti's painting elevates her sexuality to mythic proportions – and also replaces Hunt's emphasis on iconography to an emphasis on woman as icon. At the heart of the transformation of an idealised femininity – from near-angel to near-harlot – lies the artist. Placed outside 'normal' society the 'abnormal other' that is the artist may speak what is unspeakable. Victorian society was increasingly constructing a discourse of sexuality that admitted only the voice of the scientific professional. By disrupting the two strands that were 'de-mystifying' women's sexuality, one by representing her as a pure and faithful domestic doormat, and the other by reducing her

sexuality to a medical or psychiatric speciality, the artist reintroduced the mythic element into the male conception of the modern woman. Nor should we doubt the effectiveness of Pre-Raphaelite representations of femininity in providing in the decade before the 'fleshly controversy', an identity for the modern woman who threatened the sanctity of the home.

The Pre-Raphaelite woman was easily identifiable to a middle-class audience no later than 1862 when M. E. Braddon in Lady Audley's Secret uses the idea of a supposedly Pre-Raphaelite portrait of 'stunner' Lucy Grahame to suggest the underlying viciousness of that heroine. Lucy Grahame is nothing less than a 'beautiful fiend'.¹⁶ Helsinger, Sheets and Veeder, make the point that this early identification of the unnatural with the Pre-Raphaelite woman pre-dates the period when Rossetti's more identifiable images had been painted or widely known. But we should remember that the publication of the novel follows the period of the private 1857 Pre-Raphaelite exhibition and later of the Hogarth Club. Braddon mentions a 'strange sinister light' in the eyes of the sitter that echoes the critic of the 1857 exhibition who was struck by the unnatural effects of light in the work of both Rossetti and Hunt. There is, then, little reason to deny the potency of a Pre-Raphaelite image of woman which provides an identifiable stereotype. That stereotype, as early as 1862, was at once desirable and frightening. Griselda Pollock dates the inception of Rossetti's production of 'female heads with floral attributes' to 1858. So we may safely assume that at least some of these paintings had been on view in the private exhibitions that the artist preferred.¹⁷ Pollock's essay on images of Pre-Raphaelite women proceeds to discuss their iconic nature in a context that has an important bearing on my discussion of the links between sexuality and professionalism.

Pollock suggests that in such images as Lady Lilith (1868) and Astarte Syriaca (1877), we see 'working-class prostitutes and "primitive" peoples. . . embody[ing] a female sexuality antipathetic to the bourgeois regulations institutionalised as femininity.'¹⁸ In producing such images Rossetti, according to Pollock, is not seeking to define or understand 'woman' but rather to redefine what it means to be male: 'woman is the sign, not of woman, but of the Other in whose mirror masculinity must define itself'.¹⁹ This idea is, of course, a product not only of feminist criticism but was actually part of the masculine project. Jung wrote that the western romantic tradition symbolised the worship of the masculine soul by the 'worship of woman.' According to Jung this was seen by Goethe as a project to 'unify the opposites', presumably of flesh and spirit, but is 'nowhere more beautifully and perfectly expressed than in Dante's Divine Comedy'.²⁰ There can be little doubt of Rossetti's intention to use women to symbolise aspects of the masculine soul – an issue that is evident in the early prose piece 'Hand and Soul' in The Germ (1850). However, the effect of this project is to produce a 'fetishized' image of woman that is seen but not seeing and, as Pollock convincingly maintains, continues into the twentieth century in the guise of the Hollywood screen goddess. Pollock argues that the Pre-Raphaelite and Aesthetic artists and intellectuals, of whom Rossetti is perhaps the most significant member, negotiated, for the bourgeois order 'the accommodation of masculine sexuality, effecting an ideological form of representation on behalf of the class they served'.²¹ But there does seem to be an inherent contradiction in Pollock's argument in that the images are seen as at once 'antipathetic' to the bourgeoisie, while at the same time providing an 'ideological form' that serves their class interests.

This apparent contradiction in Pollock's critique can be answered if we identify the emergence of a separate 'professional' fraction of the middle class and argue that the later Pre-Raphaelite and Aesthetic production was a reflection of their class concerns rather than those of the entrepreneurial middle class. However, the mutability of such avant-garde projects to the increasingly consumer-led popular art of the bourgeoisie indicates the influence of the professional class and its commercial importance to the wider middle class in the ideological production of what is desirable. The aesthetic production of the avant-garde is only palatable to the middle class in general once it has been interpreted and packaged by the professional fraction. Similarly, the middle class maintains its belief in the 'otherness' and sexual strangeness of the artist because it has no contact with the artist, either physically or intellectually. The middle class accepts the judgement of the avant-garde fraction of the professional class on matters of taste, but questions the healthiness and normality of that group's sexuality and thereby the relevance of that taste to those with what are deemed to be normal healthy desires. The artists themselves were financially dependent on collectors who were willing to cultivate critics and artists rather than follow popular taste. Indeed, the patron who was impressed enough to pay Rossetti 450 guineas for Lady Lilith was unlikely to let his taste be swayed by such a large and ugly thing as public opinion.

Frederick Leyland (1831 – 92), the self-made Liverpool shipbuilder who commissioned the painting of Lady Lilith, possessed other paintings of women by both Rossetti and Burne-Jones, and he commissioned Whistler to paint his wife's portrait. In 1872, Leyland insisted that Rossetti repaint the face of Lilith, replacing the portrait of Fanny Cornforth with that of the fashionable beauty, Alexa

Wilding. Rossetti's negotiations with Leyland led the artist, in 1873, to write a letter to Ford Madox Brown, where he states: 'I have often said that to be an artist is just the same thing as to be a whore, as far as dependence on the whims and fancies of individuals is concerned'.²² It is here, with the removal of the likeness of the 'working-class prostitute', that the intended meaning for Rossetti's painting breaks down and is reconstructed by the desires of the patron. Rossetti's choice of model and the legend of Lilith suggest that the picture was intended as a commentary on the nature of the prostitute and of prostitution. In requesting that the soft, sensual and essentially earthy attractions of Fanny were replaced by the chilly charms of Alexa, Leyland subverted Rossetti's intentions, but also enriched the variety of commercial and sexual transactions which invest Lady Lilith. Lilith now had the same face as Sybylla Palmifera, who was 'soul's' beauty. Leyland's request and Rossetti's acquiescence have combined to suggest a dual nature for femininity – at once pure and corrupt. Rossetti pictures her danger as availability – as we can see from the sonnet that complements the painting, where Rossetti's speaker describes Lilith's charms:

Is he not found, O Lilith, whom shed scent
And soft-shed kisses and soft sleep shall snare?
Lo! as that Youth's eyes burned at thine, so went
Thy spell through him, and left his straight neck bent
And round his heart one strangling golden hair.²³

Like the prostitute, Lilith ensnares by providing sexual gratification and sensual pleasure, but at a price. Youth's neck is bent, but it is his heart that has been strangled – and strangled, no less, by the golden thread that binds him to Lilith. As Lilith's sexuality is compromised because it is an end in itself – she has no soul

to share love nor can she produce children, the fruit of love – the prostitute's very availability destroys love because that availability – her gift for sexuality – is controlled by the cash nexus. In other words, the heart is strangled by the 'golden thread' that dictates the relationship of the whore and the client. Yet for Rossetti the professional sexuality of the whore that he so closely associated with the financial success of his painting must have generated a feeling of partnership, even equality and intimacy of soul, with the prostitutes of his imagination. The tension and anxiety that exists for Rossetti around the conjunction of sexuality and social class is tangible in Lady Lilith.

It is certain that Rossetti's concerns with sexuality and class were also felt by those in his circle. They shared a belief, as expressed by Rossetti, that serious literature and art was the arena in which to exercise questions of sexuality. The Rossetti 'clique' was beginning to act as an intellectual elite, feeling itself specially able to distinguish between serious and popular art. In 1871, Rossetti wrote to F. G. Stephens that the picture he was working on was 'a serious effort . . . and professes to hold its own against any modern work whatever'.²⁴ Such a demarcation, however, was far from clear in the artistic and literary world, and until the nature and identity of the professionals whose task it would be to form an avant-garde art and to interpret it were identified by informed critics – or at least the boundaries marked – disputes about the proper concerns of art were inevitable. One such dispute followed the publication in 1870 of Rossetti's Poems.

The 1870 edition of Poems was pieced together from largely unpublished works produced over twenty years. Although some of Rossetti's early poetry had been seen in The Germ (1850), it had been extensively revised and added to during the following decade. In 1862, in a dramatic and romantic gesture Rossetti

had consigned the only manuscript copies of his early poetry to the grave of his wife, Elizabeth Rossetti, née Siddal. High melodrama devolved into gothic farce when in 1869 Rossetti arranged for the worm-eaten manuscripts to be retrieved from her coffin. Rossetti went to enormous lengths to tip the balance of critical opinion in his favour by exhorting friends and admirers to flood the press with their admiring notices. What is extraordinary, as David G. Riede has pointed out, is not that Rossetti wished to make these arrangements, but that there were so many 'poets and critics [willing] to sing his praises.' Not only did intimates like Swinburne and Sidney Colvin 'eulogise him, and, more remarkable still, . . . do so sincerely', but also William Morris (if grudgingly), and Philip Bourke Marston and Thomas Gordon Hake, who were not members of the immediate Pre-Raphaelite circle also gave him support.²⁵ Yet, in spite of the careful arrangements of friends to review the collection in leading journals, Rossetti still came under attack.

In October 1871, Robert Buchanan launched his notorious and vicious attack on 'The Fleshly School of Poetry,' in the Contemporary Review.²⁶ Buchanan's vitriolic review clearly reawakened Rossetti's fears of criticism and also appears to have contributed to Rossetti's subsequent ill health. Sympathisers have ever since been inclined to blame Buchanan for Rossetti's unfortunate decline.²⁷ On this point, Christopher D. Murray goes so far as to declare: 'Buchanan's attacks certainly hastened Rossetti's death and caused the rupture of several relationships of significance to Rossetti, particularly his close friendship with Swinburne'.²⁸ Indeed, Buchanan has been represented as acting from jealousy and spite, and from an inflated sense of his own poetic ability. This last accusation, of course, was the very one he directed at the Fleshly School. While

Buchanan centres his attack on the supposed sensualism advocated by Swinburne, Rossetti and their circle, he is clearly disturbed that his own worth as a poet is undermined by this clique. The fact that Buchanan had suffered adverse criticism from one of Rossetti's circle—at the hands of the artist's brother, William, no less—provides sufficient evidence to support Buchanan's belief that the group placed little value on his work. Murray writes that Buchanan was 'determined to make Rossetti's debut as a poet as tempestuous as his own had been declared to be by W. M. Rossetti in 1866'.²⁹ It was certainly the case that Buchanan was inclined to over-estimate both his own importance and his talent as a poet. Swinburne rudely described Buchanan as a 'poetaster', and posterity has not corrected this view. Yet Buchanan's incontrovertible marginality probably added conviction to his belief that by supporting each other Colvin, Swinburne and the Rossettis were perpetrating some kind of fraud on the periodical and poetry reading public. Indeed, Buchanan at times seems on the verge of stating outright that the Fleshly poets' tendency 'mutually to praise, extol, and imitate each other' amounts to a foul conspiracy. In the event he seems to stop just short of this claim. Buchanan is satisfied to suggest a more casual arrangement—that the Fleshly poets 'have fairly earned for themselves the title of the Mutual Admiration School'.³⁰

To an extent, Buchanan's condemnation of the Fleshly School's partisan puffery was justifiable. Had he limited himself to questioning the propriety of friendly artists publishing favourable criticisms of each other's work Buchanan might well have fared better. While I doubt whether it would have been given much credence (it is central to the formation of a professional ideal that it is professional peers who make judgements of the professional's work and that

outsiders are unqualified to do so), such a limited attack would have been unlikely to have caused so much offence. Buchanan chose instead to question the taste and morality of the poets. Of Rossetti, Buchanan declared that '[h]ere is a full-grown man, presumably intelligent and cultivated, putting on record for other full-grown men to read, the most secret mysteries of sexual connection'.³¹ Buchanan's approach reflects that of the entrepreneurial fraction of the middle class and was perceived by the more sophisticated and intellectual fractions as 'Podsnappery'—hence Charles Dickens's famous satire³²—and was primarily intended to protect the 'young person' from corruption (in fact, just that sort of corruption that the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885 was intended to suppress).³³ Yet, in spite of placing his attack on the sensitive question of youthful innocence endangered, it would be a mistake to assume that Buchanan's criticism is undertaken in a spirit of so called 'Victorian' repression.

Oswald Doughty, in his biography of Rossetti, seems to suggest that the poet had something to fear from the use of the term 'fleshly', and that it indicated a Victorian abhorrence of things sexual:

'Fleshly', for the mid-Victorians had all the mystic power of a word that embodies a contemporary complex, a word energised by all the repressions of taboo, in this case the mid-Victorian taboo upon any unnecessary exposure of the body in actuality, and upon its counterpart in the world of art; the ban upon realism, upon nudity, upon passion, which Dickens so amusingly caricatured in the person of Mr. Podsnap and his obsessional fear lest anything in art should 'bring a blush to the cheek of the young person'.³⁴

Doughty's reading of the Victorian response to fleshliness is typical of a mid-twentieth-century attitude to that period. Although sexuality assuredly presented a problem for the emergent middle classes, their solution was not, as is often supposed, that it should be absolutely denied and suppressed. As Foucault argued in Introduction to the History of Sexuality, the middle classes used their model of sexuality to support the positive and healthy image they presented of a society ordered by bourgeois values:

[O]ne of its [the bourgeoisie's] primary concerns was to provide itself with a body and a sexuality — to ensure the strength, endurance, and secular proliferation of that body through the organisation of a deployment of sexuality.³⁵

The popular bourgeois image of the sexuality of the aristocracy and workers (represented by painters such as Hogarth) was that the eighteenth century had left those unfortunate classes poxed and polluted, both physically and ideologically. The self-image of Victorian bourgeois sexuality, then, was one of healthiness enshrined in individuality and competition. In the 1860s and after, Darwinian theories of natural selection further confirmed the relationship of competition to healthful sexuality. Certainly ignorance and abstinence were not seen as necessarily healthy as the Victorian period progressed. Peter Gay's influential The Bourgeois Experience (1984) sets out to 'complicate and correct, those tenacious misconceptions' that surrounded Victorian middle-class sexuality. He argues that while there were indeed 'impotent husbands, frigid wives, young men and women innocent of the most elementary facts of life', there must have been many couples like those he discussed who found 'regular and lawful satisfaction' in their sexuality.³⁶ Nevertheless, the attack that Buchanan makes on

the propriety of Rossetti's poems was one that would effectively raise condemnation in some fractions of the middle class.

In his defence of his work Rossetti insisted that it was far more concerned with the soul and spirit than with the body. Responding to Buchanan, Rossetti, in his essay entitled 'The Stealthy School of Criticism', makes a point of insisting that 'Love-Sweetness', one of the sonnets in his ambitious 'House of Life' sequence, is evidence of his concern for the soul:

For here all the passionate delights of the body are declared—
somewhat figuratively, it is true, but unmistakably—to be of
naught if not ennobled by the concurrence of the soul at all
times.³⁷

While he tries to expose as unfair criticism Buchanan's assertions that the flesh is his only consideration, Rossetti does not deny the flesh entirely. Rossetti shared a growing belief that while such topics were not suitable for children and servants, educated men and women had nothing to fear from a more frank discussion. In the same article Rossetti went on to say:

I may, nevertheless, take a wider view than some poets or critics,
of how much, in the material conditions absolutely given to man
to deal with as distinct from his spiritual aspirations, is
admissible within the limits of Art.³⁸

The idea that art should avoid topics that might embarrass a young girl or corrupt a servant was being challenged in theory and in practice. Yet it is on the fear of such corruption that Buchanan plays. Rossetti's supporters, on the other hand, attack not Buchanan's prudery, but his competence.

The vigorous defence of Rossetti, undertaken by his friends, as well as by the poet himself, was in the spirit of modern professionalism – Buchanan was seen to fail to meet current standards of critical performance. Buchanan's criticism depended too much upon the mores of the representation of sexuality that prevailed earlier in the century. Although sexuality might be implicit in, for example, Dickens's fiction, it is never explicit.³⁹ Jeffrey Weeks makes the interesting historical point that pornography 'begins to exist significantly some time during the middle of the eighteenth century'.⁴⁰ The rise of pornography, then, is synchronous with that of the novel, the modern literary form. As modern novelists and poets begin to approach the explicit concerns of the pornographer, so the public for the general novel and that for advanced literature become two identifiable groups. The fleshly controversy illustrates the growing division between a popular art and an art claimed by an exclusive, cultivated audience.

Few, if any, analysts of Victorian sexuality (apart from Michael Mason in The Making of Victorian Sexuality (1994)) have approached their topic with recognition of the full significance of the emerging professional. Nor, for that matter, did Harold Perkin give any consideration to the importance of sexuality (or even the artist) in the development of that ideal. Yet the presence of professionals is evident in all discussions on sexuality, and sexuality must represent a given in any construction of an ideal of professional masculinity. Linda Dowling, for example, uses the fleshly controversy to exemplify her own theory on Victorian male sexuality, which in its Foucaudian awareness is at once more complex and engaging than Allen's.⁴¹ Dowling argues that the foundation of the Fleshly scandal lies in images of French Revolutionary womanhood. She claims that 'Liberty', bare-breasted at the head of the mob, conjured up fears of

unrestrained sexuality inciting the populous to copulation and thus to its infinite enlargement through promiscuous reproduction. According to Dowling, Blackwood's Magazine perceived the same dangerous incitement to lower-class sexuality in the Cockney School of poets of the early nineteenth century as was present in the French symbol of 'Liberty'. Buchanan's failure to ignite similar fears in his readers, Dowling says, lies in the success of liberal politics in the intervening years. Dowling identifies the necessary change in class awareness for this political transformation to exist in the growing influence of the middle-class ideology. The problem with Dowling's analysis is that it over-simplifies both social and linguistic developments. The reality of class relationships in the ideological changes that were taking place were more intricate than Dowling suggests. She maintains that:

Buchanan's denunciations of the Fleshly School derived from Buchanan's own gigantic miscalculation in imagining that he could mobilise the forces of Victorian moral propriety against Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Pre-Raphaelites in just the same way as, earlier in the century, Blackwood's Magazine had mobilised public opinion against Keats and Leigh Hunt as a Cockney School of poetry.⁴²

While I agree with Dowling that Buchanan borrowed both the language and moral outrage of that earlier campaign, and that his failure to successfully mobilise public opinion was due to the 'momentous ideological transformation' that had occurred between Blackwood's attack and the publication of Rossetti's poem, I question her interpretation of the nature of that change. Dowling produces a convincing argument to support her view that John Lockhart and

Christopher North, when attacking the Cockney School in Blackwood's, were responding to a perceived Jacobin threat inherent in the sensual poetry of John Keats and Leigh Hunt. Buchanan's adoption of the Blackwood's vehemence 'seemed out of place, excessive, crude, violently illiberal, and therefore unworthy of the support of any self-respecting Victorian liberal.' But Dowling illustrates this assertion with an example that is far from any Victorian liberal. She writes that '[m]eeting G. H. Lewes and George Eliot one day in Regent's Park, Buchanan was stunned to find himself reproached by one and cut by the other'.⁴³ Lewes and Eliot are very much representatives of the emerging class of professional intellectuals. Although I find Dowling's analysis of the Blackwood's assault of the Cockney poets very engaging, I am not convinced that a continuation of the analysis is enlightening in the case of Buchanan's attack on Rossetti.

If we look at the British eighteenth-century tradition of republican commentary outlined in John Barrell's essay 'The Dangerous Goddess', it quickly becomes clear that the question of sexuality in the fine arts had a long and problematical tradition. Barrell cites the Earl of Shaftesbury as the founder of a discourse that saw the fine arts as having a function in preparing the patrician class for civic life. The role of painting and sculpture was, through elevating narratives extolling the virtues of the Ancients, to point the way to 'manly virtue' and away from 'effeminate luxury'. For the work of art to fulfil this function adequately it was necessary for the pleasures of the flesh to be illustrated in all their seductive beauty.⁴⁴ While Buchanan may owe much to the form of the Blackwood's campaign, there was a strong moral tradition promoting the use of the flesh that had formed the basis of the Royal Academy's training both before and after the attacks on the Cockney poets. Buchanan's inability to encompass the

whole professional debate around the mobilisation of the flesh is an indication of his remoteness from advanced aesthetic thinking—rather than his redundant politics and morality. He was clinging to a mid-Victorian belief in public opinion as an arbiter of taste—a belief that both Shaftesbury and Ruskin would have derided. In the next section I will show in some detail the nature of Buchanan's failure, and show it to be a professional, rather than political, miscalculation.

II

Buchanan's critical method aims to exaggerate the corrupting influence of the Fleshly School while minimising their artistic and cultural importance. The Fleshly Poets are awarded some slight and judicious praise; Buchanan admits that in 'their own place, the gentlemen are interesting and useful'.⁴⁵ But their small strengths, according to Buchanan, are outweighed by two great faults—their fleshliness and their persuasive appeal. Buchanan does not accuse the Fleshly School of attempting a wholesale corruption but of 'spasmodic ramifications in the erotic direction'.⁴⁶ Buchanan claims that, while Tennyson is their respectable poetic precursor, the Fleshly School has been led into sensual excess because they lack their mentor's restraining intellectual qualities. Tennyson had, in 'Vivien', 'indicated for them the bounds of sensualism in art,' and such sensualism becomes unwholesome 'when there is no moral or intellectual quality to control it'.⁴⁷ 'Vivien', one of the first four books published as The Idylls of the King in 1859, tells the story of Vivien, who was the harlot of Arthur's court and seducer of Merlin. The long years in which he gained his wisdom, Merlin 'kept his mind on one sole aim,/Nor ever touch'd fierce wine, nor tasted flesh,/Nor owned a sensual wish'.⁴⁸ Although Tennyson deals with the sensual in the Idylls, it is, in the words of Walter Houghton, to show that 'a society founded on the highest

moral ideals, above all that of purity, is gradually undermined by adultery and fornication'.⁴⁹ So in exploring that particular moral question Tennyson remains safely within existing moral and artistic boundaries.

Tennyson sets new bounds – those which Buchanan identifies as the extent to which sensualism can go – when he has Merlin defend Vivien by comparing her behaviour with that of the men in court. While all are brave, only 'some are chaste', and Arthur alone is stainless. Buchanan's interpretation of Rossetti suggests a negative quality in the fleshliness of the poets, indicating a fear of a 'body' out of society's control. These young Tennysonians lack a manly control of their art. Indeed, Buchanan describes their mental set as that of the 'intellectual hermaphrodite', an idea that might have generated from his reading of Swinburne's poetry. This inadequate artistic virility, or effeminacy, is at the heart of what Buchanan calls their 'aesthetic terminology'.

The agenda of the Fleshly School, according to Buchanan, is little less than a complete distortion of the aims and virtues of art and poetry. It is clear to Buchanan that 'the fleshly gentlemen have bound themselves by solemn league and covenant to extol fleshliness as the distinct and supreme end of poetic and pictorial art'.⁵⁰ Buchanan, says Dowling, was enraged by the vicious streets of London in the 1870s. He found the streets full of nude photographs and 'indecent, and hideous harlots'.⁵¹ In Rossetti's poetry, Buchanan feels that he has 'located the source of all this "fleshliness".' Yet Buchanan did not invent the fleshly label, and although it was Buchanan who attacked Rossetti for his 'fleshliness', it was not he who first identified this characteristic in the artist. Doughty identifies Frederic Stephens, one-time Pre-Raphaelite Brother and from 1859 the *Athenaeum's* art critic, as the source of this figure of speech. In 1865 Stephens, carried away by the

skin tones in Rossetti's painting, had allowed his language to become so extravagant when discussing the Blue Bower that he had described 'the marvellous fleshliness of the flesh.' It is even possible that the 'fleshly' description originated from Rossetti himself. There is certainly evidence that Rossetti provided Stephens with descriptions of paintings for the critic to include in his notices.⁵² Stephens's 'fleshliness', however, is not associated, as is Buchanan's, with vice. Two years later, Sidney Colvin, writing of Rossetti's work in the Fortnightly Review, had said: 'On the value and significance of the flesh this painter insists on the utmost'.⁵³ Doughty goes on to write that:

Swinburne, the following year, in Notes on Some Pictures of 1868, had similarly dwelt, in language of unrestrained rhetoric, alliteration and enthusiasm, upon 'the sleepy splendour' of Lilith as 'a fit raiment for the idea incarnate of faultless fleshly beauty,' had praised Sibylla Palmifera, 'as ripe and firm of flesh as her softer and splendid sister,' and pointed out in tones of deep emotion that La Pia 'presses the deadly marriage-ring into the flesh of her finger, so deep that the soft skin is bloodless and blanched from the intense imprint of it.' So stirred indeed was he, that he likened Lilith with 'those terrible tender lips,' to Théophile Gautier's creation, 'the hero of the most perfect and exquisite book of modern times — Mademoiselle de Maupin [1835 — 6]'.⁵⁴

On their 'fleshliness', then, the Fleshly School seem to be agreed, which would appear to contradict Doughty's own evaluation of the expression 'fleshly' as a terminally dangerous one. Clearly, the use of the word that Buchanan makes is very different in its intention from that of Swinburne, Stephens and Colvin. The

'fleshliness' of which they speak is a tribute to both the realism of Rossetti's work and its sympathy with femininity. While it does speak of a certain sensuality their criticism is pointing more to the contrast between Rossetti's work and the bloodless women of mainstream art and poetry. But to Buchanan 'fleshliness' seems to communicate not life – but sickness and death.

The language of Buchanan's review echoes the earlier criticism of the Pre-Raphaelites that began in 1850. At that time a number of critics used a language filled with images of disease and ill-health to describe the work of the Pre-Raphaelites, especially Millais's Christ in the Carpenter's Shop. It is the tone of this criticism to which Buchanan reverts. He describes 'fleshliness' as a disease of dangerous contagion and says of Rossetti and the others that 'their complaint too is catching, and carries off many young persons'.⁵⁵ Rossetti is described as an artist who, like Simeon Solomon, 'conceives unpleasantly, and draws ill'.⁵⁶ While Buchanan admits that Rossetti has qualities as a colourist this is a compliment that hides a thorn. Rossetti's skills with colour have invaded his verses and promote the same weaknesses that permeate his paintings. These qualities as a colourist are 'to be found abundantly among his verses.' 'There is', continues Buchanan, 'the same thinness and transparency of design, the same combination of the simple and the grotesque, the same morbid deviation from healthy forms of life'.⁵⁷ It would appear that Buchanan is combining the language of disease associated with the early attacks on Pre-Raphaelitism to the traditional discourse of the dilettante critic. The terms that eighteenth-century connoisseurs developed from the academic manuals of painting stressed the intellectual qualities of design or drawing and the sensual character of colour. This language passed into early periodical art criticism and its influence on non-specialist 'hacks' was strong.⁵⁸ By

stressing Rossetti's dependence on colour for the effects achieved by his paintings, Buchanan is reinforcing the charges of sensuality while his attacks on the artist's design and drawing skills undermine Rossetti's intellectual status.

As well as impugning Rossetti's moral and intellectual character, Buchanan attacks the circumstances in which Rossetti has made his reputation. It is the operation of the group, the 'Rossetti clique', to which he objects. The Rossetti 'clique' is an example of Raymond Williams's 'cultural formations' and, like the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood itself, representing the next stage in the development of artistic and intellectual activities that follows the rise of the Academies and the 'professional societies'. Buchanan is still discussing the same phenomenon that the reviewer of the first Pre-Raphaelite Exhibition of 1857 noted: that Rossetti was gaining a large, but private, reputation without publicly exhibiting his work. This closet fame is treated by Buchanan as some sleight of hand that is deceiving the public. He maintains that Rossetti has 'shrunk from publicly exhibiting his pictures, and from allowing anything of a popular estimate to be formed of their qualities'.⁵⁹ While Rossetti certainly did abstain from exhibition, it could hardly have been in the expectation that he would gain greater fame from this self-exclusion. It is almost as if Buchanan believed that Rossetti's privacy masked the practice of some perverse and closeted sexual magic that conjured up an illusion of fame. Buchanan was complaining of a fact—Rossetti's considerable reputation—and suggesting that his fame existed because public opinion had not tested it. But what is clear from Rossetti's career is the growing irrelevancy of public opinion in the formation of an artist's success. The professional ideal was surely advocating the primacy of expert opinion and in a dispute over the worth of art and literature it was the opinions of experts not the public that mattered.

Yet Buchanan, as a poet, was an expert of sorts. In spite of this nominal expertise his criticism failed to have any real effect on the way Rossetti's work was viewed. How were Buchanan's expert views so effectively negated? An answer lies, perhaps, in the tradition of mutual support that had developed because of the prolonged criticism to which Pre-Raphaelitism had been subjected.

The early castigation by academic artists that once centred on the skills and aesthetic beliefs of the Pre-Raphaelites was now diminishing. While those often vitriolic criticisms had distressed Rossetti, it was Millais and Hunt, as the principal exhibitees, who had absorbed the largest share of vilification. In 1871 disapproval was focused on a lifestyle and on an identifiably aesthetic or Pre-Raphaelite appearance that were associated much more directly with Rossetti. While that particular Pre-Raphaelite style of painting which we associate with Rossetti was gaining in influence and approval (certainly among the young and advanced), artists and critics outside the charmed circle questioned the moral integrity of its practitioners and apologists. So the morality that motivated Buchanan's attack is clearly neither simple nor mechanistic. Although there can be little doubt that the influence of both lower middle-class non-conformist Christianity and the growing ethos of the 'muscular' Christians, like Charles Kingsley, play their part, the language Buchanan uses is influenced by the language of Blackwood's attack on the Cockney school with its foundations in eighteenth-century debates on art. Unlike Dowling, who sees Buchanan's fault as a political regression, I believe that his atavism is linguistic. Buchanan cannot use the modern language of criticism because that expresses too clearly the values of those whom he attacks. In seeking authority for his abhorrence of the Fleshly School, Buchanan has to find it in an archaic discourse. However successful the

model for Buchanan's criticism was in its denigration of 'Cockney' poetry, a later generation had rejected that criticism and overturned its judgement. In other words, Buchanan articulates the critique of the already vanquished. Although that language in its robust masculinity was still part of the mainstream of bourgeois culture, it was no longer the specialist language of criticism. In effect, the professional defence of the fleshly was that the public as a whole were not qualified to judge the art of mature and cultivated men. In this the elitist Fleshly School had, if anything, reverted to the arguments that Barrell identifies in Shaftesbury and critics in the early eighteenth century. Art was deployed by Shaftesbury and Turnbull to legitimise the claims to rule of the republican aristocracy because of their demonstrable virtue and polish. The moral narrative of History painting taught the path of duty but it was felt that art 'should exhibit the naked body if it is to make the citizen polite as well as virtuous'.⁶⁰ But such edification was not suitable for the 'vulgar' – that is, the lower classes – since to such people only the sensual pleasures of art would be discernible. A similarly elitist belief is the foundation of the Aesthetic creed in the 1870s and 1880s, but on this occasion landed wealth and aristocratic birth have been replaced by the qualifications of intellect and sensitivity – and, what is more, experienced through the 'feminine' rather than symbolised by it. The counterattack on Buchanan centred, then, not on a call for a popular judgement, but on a questioning of his professional status aimed at convincing an intellectual elite.

In the informed discussions of the cognoscenti that followed the Fleshly debate, judgement tended to be given in the light of advanced professional practices. Walter Hamilton, one of the first writers to review the incidents some ten years later in 1882, was angered by the very anonymity that had incensed the

'Rossetti circle.' Rossetti's associates and Hamilton were apparently further annoyed by the inclusion of Buchanan's article in the Contemporary Review; it 'being a distinctive feature of that Review that all articles should bear the actual signatures of their authors, some speculation took place as to this unknown "Thomas Maitland", whose virulent article appeared amongst others all bearing well-known names'.⁶¹ Buchanan's attempt to publish his article without admitting authorship attracted the initial disapproval of his critics but was soon followed by doubts as to the basic form which Buchanan used to argue his case. W. M. Rossetti, in his diary entry for Tuesday 17 October 1871, mentions a paragraph in the Academy of 15 October that year, apparently put in by Colvin, which refers to Buchanan's *Fleshly* article and makes the point that it is a 'curious instance of the obsolete vituperative style in criticism'.⁶² The recognition of this obsolescence is critical. W. M. Rossetti and D. G. Rossetti suggest that Buchanan, in both his aggressive 'masculine' approach and in his combative style of criticism, is not fulfilling the requirements of the modern critic.

It was Rossetti's intention to respond firmly to Buchanan's review, and it was his first inclination to write a letter. W. M. Rossetti's advice was 'to print nothing—and generally to leave the whole affair to take care of itself'.⁶³ The professional critic clearly felt that it was better to remain aloof from a debate that might draw the artist into an undignified and unprofessional wrangle. In a letter to Frederick Locker (11 November 1871), Swinburne too seems inclined to treat the writer of the *Fleshly* review with contempt and writes that he saw 'with a sense of nausea the article signed Thomas Maitland in the Contemporary, but on hearing that this signature was a mask which a pseudonymous poetaster was cowering and making mouths, I found that I was even yet capable of

astonishment (as well as disgust) at the baseness of certain professional dogs-of-letters'.⁶⁴ While Swinburne's remarks, although in many ways typical of his customary hyperbole, are expressed in strong language, such responses in kind seem to have been kept reasonably private, and public reaction to Buchanan's intemperate attack were more measured. By November that year, Rossetti's defence of his work had become more balanced, and his wish to publish it less pronounced. W. M. Rossetti wrote in his diary of Wednesday 29 November 1871: 'I confess, on hearing the thing as a whole (especially the more serious part, which replies to the substance of the objections raised by Buchanan), I think the letter such a successful performance that its suppression will be in some measure a pity after all'.⁶⁵

In his definitive biography, Doughty takes a dim view of Buchanan's article and emphasises its threat to Rossetti's career:

Such was the state of contemporary taste, almost incomprehensible to the modern world, when Rossetti's unknown assailant launched in 'The Fleshly School of Poetry,' an attack which, if successful, would brand Rossetti, for contemporaries, almost as a criminal, would deprive him of patrons and his works of commercial value.⁶⁶

While Doughty makes a reasonable evaluation of current mainstream middle-class taste, we must ask, in light of the nature of Rossetti's position in relationship to the complex cultural market in which he operated, whether Doughty is not perhaps overstating the case. While Rossetti was dependent on the good opinions of critics and patrons for his living as an artist they constituted a known and sympathetic group. In other words, those critics who approved Rossetti's work

and those patrons that bought it were committed to him as a 'man of genius'.

Rossetti's circle of sympathisers were far more likely to rush to his defence, as in fact they did, than consign him to criminality. Since further editions of Rossetti's Poems had already been released and sold by the time Buchanan launched his attack, it is even likely that the interest surrounding his poetry gained Rossetti some extra sales. In effect, Buchanan was incapable of harming Rossetti's reputation because that reputation had been developed and supported by a group who had a vested interest in maintaining it. The very system of which Buchanan complained worked to negate the consequences of his complaint.

It is important to realise how mutual was the support enjoyed by each and every member of the stigmatised Fleshly School. Just as Swinburne supported him, so too had Rossetti acted as apologist for Swinburne's controversial Poems and Ballads (1866) – although he felt that Swinburne went too far. Swinburne's poems treated 'Life' and 'Death' but, in the main, lingered over the pain of desire (not always obviously heterosexual – the 'shameless nameless love' of 'Faustine', for instance, and the suffering that seemed to be caused by both its denial and its 'feverish' release).⁶⁷ Rossetti's evaluation was shared by Ruskin, yet he was even more enthusiastic in defence of Swinburne. Although Ruskin warned Swinburne that the poems would win Swinburne 'a dark reputation', on the publication of the collection he was privately laudatory:

I consent to much – I blame, or reject, nothing. I should as soon think of finding fault with you as with a thundercloud or a nightshade blossom. All I can say . . . is that God made you, and that you are very wonderful and beautiful. To me it may be

dreadful or deadly – it may be in a deeper sense or in certain relations, helpful or medicinal.⁶⁸

Buchanan was unable to affect Rossetti's reputation because it lay in the hands of a self-contained critical unit that relied solely upon an evaluation of peers.

Rossetti's support and patronage was far more dependent on the views of this elite than on public opinion. While a commercial art world might make large fortunes for those such as Millais, and public opinion contribute greatly to their wealth, such populist vagaries could not undermine the professional standing supported by the emergent 'cultural formations'. Buchanan's form of attack, therefore, was essentially misplaced. While it might still have had some affect on the commercial art market it was hopelessly out of date in its attack on a modern cultural elite.

While Buchanan was guilty of misunderstanding the changing nature of cultural activity, the Fleshly School in its turn was overly sensitive to his criticism. Some indication of the effect this affair had on Rossetti might be guessed from the fact that he mentions it nearly ten years later in a letter to Jane Morris. Yet while he continues in 1880 to make a judgement on the behaviour of Buchanan in terms of a new professional standard of criticism – in this instance he accuses Buchanan of plagiarising part of his Fleshly article – Rossetti also points up how anachronistic Buchanan's style of criticism is. Rossetti maintained that he had recently found two sources of Buchanan's article in Joseph Cottle's book on Samuel Taylor Coleridge. According to Rossetti, Buchanan had made use of 'a most spiteful but amusing letter of Lamb's to Coleridge' and 'Southey's attack on Byron which occurs in the Appendix'.⁶⁹ The extent of the victory that the Pre-Raphaelite/Aesthetic fraction enjoyed in this critical encounter can be measured

by the extent of Buchanan's climb-down. In 1887 Buchanan wrote 'A Note on Dante Rossetti' and in it made grovelling amends for his earlier assaults: 'He [Rossetti] uses amatory forms and carnal images to express ideas which are purely and remotely spiritual and he takes the language of personal love to express his divine yearning'.⁷⁰ Yet even here we must question Buchanan's judgement. Certainly, this attempt to curry favour with the victors gained him no credit, and I would argue that Rossetti's value to the emergent professional class was the reverse of that stated by Buchanan. Rossetti's importance to the professional fraction of the middle class is that he uses a form evocative of pure and spiritual yearning that provides a language with which to speak of a personal love that is essentially carnal.

The debate on the 'Fleshly School of Poetry', then, polarised two sets of anxieties evident in conservative critics like Buchanan as well as in avant-garde cultural groups such as Rossetti's clique. The first set of anxieties belong to the professional practice of art and letters. The Pre-Raphaelite school and the later Aesthetic movement operated not only in a way that superseded the academies and traditions that had held earlier in the century but also in a way that provided a viable alternative to the buoyant commercial market in art that had expanded during the mid-Victorian period. Buchanan distrusted the 'mutual admiration' that was so necessary to the new, and small, cultural formations but he could find no current critical language with which to attack the Fleshly School. For this reason, Buchanan marshalled a supporting criticism around the second set of anxieties — the sexual. One might expect this to have been a devastating tactic — but that was not the case. This is so because professionalism and sexuality were linked in the construction of middle-class masculinity. Sexuality was the very site

which Rossetti's audience wished him to explore — and to explore in terms of a feminine aesthetic of sensual art. Stripped of its republican humanist politics the eighteenth-century aristocratic connoisseurship of a naked and sexual femininity, one that excluded the 'vulgar' mercantile class, was re-born in the elitist art of the Pre-Raphaelites and Aestheticism. But Rossetti's Venus is not Shaftesbury's. The debate between civic duty and pleasure is not one that exercises the poet's imagination. It is rather the duties of the individual to himself or to herself — a private and self-defined virtue — that preoccupies Rossetti. It is the relationship of the individual to work and pleasure as well as the relationship of the masculine and feminine, that forms the discussion in one of the best known poems from the collection that Buchanan criticised, 'Jenny'. For the carnality that Rossetti represented was not that symbolised by the rampant male but by the carnal nature of woman.

III

It is in the poem 'Jenny' that Rossetti pursues most explicitly his ideas on prostitution and professional middle-class masculinity. Nor was that masculinity expressed in terms of simple desire for the readily available flesh of the harlot. While Rossetti is often represented as a libertine lover of trollops and other men's wives, the question of his sexuality was one that exercised him greatly. The contradictions in Rossetti's sexuality indicate more than an emotional need for close relationships with members of both sexes, but also suggest the importance of such sexual ambiguity to the development of the identity of the professional artist — and in turn the importance of the artist (as a personality) to the emerging self-identity of the professional class. One of the identifying characteristics of the professional class was its ability to address explicit questions of sexuality, in, for

instance, legal, medical, philosophical, and generally scientific terms. While speaking the unspeakable might be considered a defining characteristic of professionalism, we must also consider the possibility that sexuality served a symbolic function for the professional in conceptualising an acceptable and functioning relationship with entrepreneurial society. It was the avant-garde artist who explored the appetites and deployment of the flesh within the material transactions of sexuality – and in that exploration sought for the possibility of an individual integrity. One of the possible readings of Rossetti's 'Jenny' is that it marks the track of such an exploration.

Of the poems that Rossetti published in 1870, 'Jenny' has perhaps received most attention. This is not surprising as the poem deals with a crucial aspect of Victorian sexuality – prostitution. Yet it is an oblique and contemplative reference to that 'social evil'. In a recent essay, Joseph Bristow examines the way this poem has been interpreted.⁷¹ Bristow draws attention to three aspects of the poem which I would like to consider: the idea of the artist as prostitute, the link between Jenny and book and sexuality and textuality, and the important role which money plays in the poem. From the opening lines in which we are introduced to 'Lazy laughing languid Jenny,/Fond of a kiss and fond of a guinea' (186),⁷² the cash nexus is clearly in play. The dissonance of that first rhyme makes the reader pause and sound silently the more obvious 'penny'. But a penny is base copper and money, and Jenny – 'whose hair,/Is countless gold incomparable'(186) – is always conceived in terms of immutable gold. Gold is central to this relationship and, as Bristow observes, serves at once as a metaphor for semen in several lines – 'I lay among your golden hair,/Perhaps the subject of your dreams,/These golden coins' – as well as signifying the currency of sexual

exchange. Nor should the image of Danaë be forgotten. Visited by Zeus in the form of a golden shower which was often depicted by renaissance artists in the form of coins, Danaë was, in the Middle Ages, often regarded as a prefiguration of the Annunciation because in some versions of the myth her virginity and purity were stressed. Gold in the myth, then, symbolises impregnation by a divine or superior being. Moreover, as Robin Sheets points out in a recent essay, some classical commentators saw the gold in terms of 'coinage to bribe the guards for entrance to Danaë's tower'.⁷³

Sheets's reading insists on an implicit misogyny and pornography in the poem. Rossetti's monologue functions to reassert the authority of the male who has been thwarted (by the prostitute's falling asleep) in his commercially legitimate aim to possess Jenny's body. This reading is the result of Sheets's deployment of 'the conventions of pornography to interpret a dramatic monologue in which an expected sexual encounter fails to take place'.⁷⁴ While Sheets's interpretation exposes the repressive power contained within the poem, 'Jenny' is often seen as expressing Rossetti's growing empathy and insight into the life of the prostitute. Daniel A. Harris, for instance, asserts that the internal narrator 'dares to think of his wife and a whore simultaneously. His radical conjunction attacks, morally and socially, the roots of Western sexism'.⁷⁵ Neither reading, of course, considers the poem in relationship to the professional ideal, although both are concerned with Victorian middle-class masculinity. Harris does, significantly, place Rossetti's poem at the beginning of a modernist tradition that exploits the interior monologue. It is a tradition that establishes an inner reality that is not entirely compromised by external experience. In terms of professionalism there is critical space for the readings of both Harris and Sheets.

While I would argue that the professional ideal modifies the gender-specific relationships inherent in the entrepreneurial ideal, this is achieved not by the denial of patriarchal power but, rather, in the appropriation of the feminine by the professional ideal. That appropriation was identified by Rossetti's critics as an effeminate lack of manly vigour in the works of modern poets.

The joint authors of The Woman Question quote one such critic at some length. Alfred Austin (later Poet Laureate following Tennyson's death in 1892) denies Swinburne's claims to the virility and masculinity of modern literature and maintains, rather, that it is 'feminine' in its nature. Austin asks if modern poetry can claim at all to appeal to men 'brave, muscular, bold, upright, chivalrous—we will not say chaste, for that is scarcely a masculine quality . . . clean—men . . . short on speech and terrible in action'.⁷⁶ While Austin is holding on to a hydraulic model of male sexuality, we can also see here the ideal of the bluff and manly youth engendered by such works as Tom Brown's Schooldays (1857). It would be a mistake to identify Austin's construction of femininity with that of Romanticism as identified by Christine Battersby.⁷⁷ In that construction, belonging to a much earlier period, femininity was transformed by the hot dry fire of the male into intuitive artistic genius. Austin's attitude, on the other hand, while probably rooted in Romantic ideology, reflects the now growing belief in a trend towards the unmanliness of the poet and artist that is surely, in part, a reflection of the increasing separation of the mainstream middle-brow middle class and an intellectual elite. T. W. Heyck, for example, comments on both the estrangement of the academic scientist, seen as unworldly, absentminded and impractical, and the alienation of the artist and writer who has lost 'sympathy with bourgeois readers'. He notes that 'literary aesthetes rejected "external" standards for their

work, especially the utilitarian and moralistic standards of the Victorians'.⁷⁸ The stance of the elitist artist is then, seen as one critical of bourgeois standards and society, yet these 'superior' artists deny the ability or the qualifications of a wider public to judge their art. Those critics and writers who feel excluded or have no sympathy for the self-proclaimed elite are, to an extent, denied a critical position: or at least denied an effective critical position. Any critic, like Buchanan, to attack the 'other-worldly' aesthete would be associated, in taste, with the materialistic entrepreneurial middle class. That fraction of the middle class, Rossetti seems to suggest in 'Jenny', demonstrates its worst behaviour in its contacts with the powerless and the weak—especially the weak that they desire.

When Rossetti asks the rhetorical and unspoken question of Jenny—'perhaps you're merely glad/That I'm not drunk or ruffianly'(189-90)—he posits the distinction between the aesthetic and the ordinary middle-class man. In so doing Rossetti establishes a more sensitive and responsive sensuality for the professional male but separates him from traditional tropes of masculinity. Mainstream critics such as Austin or Buchanan may accept the humanity of this but represent such sensibility as essentially and debilitatingly feminine. To an extent Rossetti would seem to confirm the necessary loss of a certain animal masculinity to achieve this humanity. When Rossetti hides 'Priapus to the waist,' the result is an 'eligible deity'(208). But the enlarged and bestial phallus is only hidden, not removed. For Rossetti contemplation and sympathy for the feminine is civilising and humanising, but moderates rather than emasculates the man. The position of sympathetic critics like Swinburne is that such a dialogue with the feminine confirms rather than denies the virility of the poet and results in a 'masculine tenderness'.⁷⁹ Swinburne in turn suggests that it is the critics

themselves that, in their lack of understanding, demonstrate their 'pigmy brain and emasculate spirit'. While the terms used are similar, the image of masculinity conceptualised by the opposing camps is essentially different.

Rossetti's poetry, then, identified sexual anxieties and desires that centred on modern constructions of femininity. The criticism of his poetry, by Austin and others, was that it did just that. The subject of the poetry as much, if not more than, its form was the focus of critical anxiety. The site of the debate was not only the morality and taste evidenced in discussions relating to sexual activity but that a feminine point of view might have a bearing on the nature of that debate. It should be stressed that the term 'effeminacy', like the terms 'femininity' and 'masculinity' are, in the words of Alan Sinfield, 'ideological constructs, bearing no essential relationship to men and women'.⁸⁰ The use of 'effeminacy' is grounded in misogyny, and has been from the time of Aristotle, and indicated softness and lack of endurance. Sinfield states that, at least 'up to the time of the [Oscar] Wilde trials — far later than is widely supposed — it is unsafe to interpret effeminacy as defining of, or as a signal of, same-sex passion.' Indeed, from the Elizabethan period on, Sinfield clearly demonstrates textual evidence to support the use of effeminacy as an indicator of the man who loves women too much. Later ladies' tailors became the model of the effeminate because they were 'perceived as indulging women and sharing their interests and as "heterosexually lecherous"'.⁸¹ Such a use and meaning of 'effeminacy' would have been understood by Shaftesbury — but would have been perceived only as a danger inherent in sensual art for those of vulgar mind. By the time that Austin chides the Pre-Raphaelites and the Aesthetes the benefits to the elite individual of the contemplation of beauty have been forgotten or abandoned. Implicit in Austin's image of manliness

is the belief that the Pre-Raphaelite obsession with the feminine, the beautiful and the intellectual lack true virility.

While Austin might treat this interest in women as an aberration, Carol Christ, in a recent article, points out the importance of the feminine subject in Victorian poetry.⁸² Indeed, that for 'many writers, both male and female, woman was the representative literary subject.' What is perhaps most significant is that the novelists, poets and painters who were most consistent in their effeminized vision were those that would now be considered 'serious'—Tennyson, the Brontës, George Eliot, and Rossetti among them. Christ represents this usurpation of the feminine voice by male artists as sexually charged. Tennyson, she says, 'frequently presents poetry as an erotic theft through which the male incorporates a power he locates in the female.' It is this cross-gender larceny that Christ emphasises in her article. The nature of the artistic transgression is essentially visual, and finds its earliest expression in the myths, like that of Actaeon, where the gaze of the male gains secret knowledge of the naked goddess only to be silenced before he can give voice to his vision. The homicidal gaze is, however, transformed by the Victorian poet into one that spells the death of the feminine, rather than the male, subject. Taking Robert Browning as her model, Christ exposes the 'necrophilia' that is embodied in the 'Romantic treatment of the feminine subject'. And in Browning's 'My Last Duchess' it is the portrait that is the concrete object of the 'murderous gaze'. The realisation of the Duke's portrait is to be found in those that Dante Gabriel Rossetti:

was to paint years later, his picture locates and controls its
anxiety in the depth and passion of the earnest gaze it represents.

By painting her look, the Duke can secure and privilege his own

looking. The Duke's criminality has disquieting implications for art, for a portraiture that seems to prolong and sanctify the gaze murders in order to create its privileged sight.⁸³

Christ's interpretation would seem to deny Austin's fear that poetry was becoming feminine. Rather, that the very poets whose voice Austin deplores, themselves in fear 'of the feminization of culture, . . . strove to make the female subject bear his name.'

Within this complex pattern of gender attributes in the works of male poets and artists, however, lies a contradiction. When the masculine voyeur was the victim of his own murderous gaze, the voice of the poet was unquestionably male. Dorothy Mermin writes that the role of the poet was traditionally conceived as 'inherently masculine'.⁸⁴ But throughout the emergence of the professional ideal the voice of the female writer was growing in volume and authority. The novel, which emerged as a literary force with the political and economic rise of the middle class, was, as Christ says 'concerned with the female protagonist as socially representative'.⁸⁵ While this is no doubt indicative of the concern of the middle class in establishing a regime of behaviour for women that denied her access to the masculine sphere, we must ask whether it did not also facilitate the development of the professional ideal. Did the blurring of gender boundaries that is indicated in the effeminacy identified within the advanced art and poetry of the later-Victorian period provide a space for the female voice? Mermin makes an interesting point when she writes:

Publication seemed like unwomanly self-display, or even sexual self-exposure, and could be justified more easily if one wrote novels to make money rather than poems just for glory. With less

prestige than poetry, and a less formidably male tradition, novel writing was more accessible, as new occupations often are, to women.⁸⁶

From being unwomanly in the mid-Victorian period, the practice of poetry becomes unmanly at the end. The growth of the idea that the artist was an individual of indeterminate gender provided professional and creative space for women. While that space might no more accommodate the 'womanly' woman than it did the 'manly' man, it none the less provided an alternative femininity that was neither the 'angel in the house' nor the 'whore'. Mermin suggests that the female intellectual 'tries to defer gender identification by deferring adult sexuality'. In being denied a positive sexuality, however, the female artist, as represented by popular art and literature, was receiving similar treatment to her male counterpart. The common organ that both male and female intellectuals shared was the brain. Any artistic activity in those brains was clearly felt to have a contrary effect on the genitals.

The idea that there was a relationship between libidinal activity and intellectual development was not a new one. Yet these beliefs do not truly explain the growing association in the minds of critics and others of Pre-Raphaelite and aesthetic artists with, not an absence of sexuality, but rather an unnatural sexuality. Mason traces such ideas back at least as far as William Godwin who was an active critic of Thomas Malthus at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Belief in either a concomitant or an intentional lessening of sexual desire gained ground during the Victorian period. In 1850 W. E. Hickson postulated the idea that the 'cultivation of the intellectual faculties' would 'moderate the intensity of the passions', while in 1852 Herbert Spencer,

confining himself to the relationship of mental activity to sperm count was effectively, according to Mason, 'telling us also that the intellectual has only a moderate sexual appetite'.⁸⁷ Much earlier, in 1821, the Edinburgh Monthly Review, again in a discussion of Malthus, went so far as to suggest that in the future an increasing number of men and women involved in 'political, artistic and intellectual life' would be permanently celibate.⁸⁸ Austin's criticism in Temple Bar in 1869 places this artistic deviance firmly within the practice of viewing the world from 'a woman's point of view'.⁸⁹ It is Austin's contention that this practice has emasculated art which had become primarily concerned with the representation of women, especially in literature.

The representation of a world populated by, or seen, notionally, through the eyes of women, and the effeminacy it was thought to engender were very much part of the perception that the middle class had of Pre-Raphaelitism. Yet what that sexual ambiguity achieves is a relaxation of the gender-specific criteria that delineate the nature of the artist. The professional position is one that is critical of the very gender-specific 'virtues' of the entrepreneurial male. It is this implied criticism of a marauding and rampant male sexuality, one based on material possession, that also identifies Rossetti's position in relation to the market, commerce and, ultimately, capitalism. Jenny is available for a price, she is a commodity. But Jenny is only goods in so far as men wish to buy and sell her, and she is rehabilitated as a person rather than an object, for Rossetti, in the sympathy and tenderness of her poet/client. We should not forget that for Rossetti the image of the prostitute was one he associated with the artist—by implication the oldest profession stood for the relationship that existed between wealth and all of the professions. The importance of sexuality to the professional

debate, then, was not only to establish the nature of professional masculinity but to modify the nature of the medium of exchange between the sexes. By representing women as more spiritual, the Pre-Raphaelites opened up the idea of a relationship between men and women that was other than purchaser and commodity. But if Rossetti was questioning the relationship of men and women he was also most certainly concerned with relations between men and men. In the next section I will be considering the ways in which a concern with a feminine viewpoint can be seen to work to the advantage of the male Aesthete.

IV

In a recent book, Victorian Masculinities (1995), Herbert Sussman identifies the sexual preoccupations of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood with those of the Victorian middle class as a whole:

The fantasy of the immured woman awaiting the liberating penetration of male sexual desire accounts for the appeal to these young men of Measure for Measure, a play that in moving between the extremes of sexual control and sexual license appeared to the brothers to engage the central problematic of Victorian masculinity, the regulation of sexuality.⁹⁰

While Sussman's arguments, which centre on male bonding and the idea of the monastery, have a bearing on early Pre-Raphaelite production and confirm its relationship to the earlier development of the professional ideal, those arguments provide a less convincing explanation of later Pre-Raphaelitism. The reason for his difficulty in progressing a coherent argument from the 1850s to the 1860s and 1870s lies in Sussman's failure to identify a separate professional ideology as emerging from the middle class during that period. Sussman's characterisation of

Pre-Raphaelitism emphasises the emergence of their aesthetic from a monastic tradition of male bonding. This is how he puts his case:

the Brotherhood shared the project of Carlyle and Browning, forging within the gendered field of early Victorian aesthetics a specifically masculine aesthetic, creating or, in their historicist terms, re-creating a manly visual art that differentiated manly practice from the feminine by associating art production with the work of the male sphere, that took as its subject and as its goal the regulation of male desire, and that was energised in its practice by male-male bonding.⁹¹

The problem with Sussman's analysis is that it insists on the differentiation of 'manly practice from the feminine'. The logic of such an aesthetic would tend to move away from the representation of the feminine. While it might be true of Carlyle's generation that 'associating art production with the work of the male sphere' was a fundamental of their aesthetic, this was not true of the PRB. While they clearly began their working lives in a professional atmosphere that valued Carlyle's aesthetic, it was their desire to succeed professionally that led them to their choices of technique and subject. Thus the religious subjects that Sussman points to as defining masculine activity were introduced by Rossetti, the others following after the success of the Girlhood of the Virgin Mary. In any case, Rossetti's two early religious paintings (the Annunciation being the other) foregrounded the feminine point of view. While Hunt and Millais can be said to have supported an aesthetic that had as its goal the 'regulation of male desire' in their early work, it is Rossetti's aesthetic that is ultimately successful. Rossetti explores and represents sexuality, rather than seeking to regulate it. The

regulation of sexuality was the ideology of an earlier generation and must be associated with the entrepreneurial middle class. While members of the professional fraction may have assisted in such regulation, it was not the intention of those whose activities helped to form the professional ideology.

The growing interest in investigating sexuality that was evident in science, identified sexuality as a discipline in which the professional intellectual had a legitimate interest. This interest was characterised by an unshrinking willingness to represent clearly sexual behaviour and physical detail—albeit in terms incomprehensible to the layman. In a similar spirit, younger artists were willing to experiment with anatomically accurate, rather than conventional, representations of the naked figure—if only for their own professional consumption. The practice of producing ever more explicit representations of sexuality went against the tendency of mainstream academic art. In the early 1860s, there had been discussion in the Royal Academy on restrictions in life-drawing for members and students. It was suggested that a law preventing unmarried students under twenty drawing from the female model should be rescinded. This move was quickly smothered and even more stringent restrictions suggested. Sir Edwin Landseer thought it worth considering 'the adoption of some means of rendering the study of the nude model in the Life School, less offensive to decency and morality'. After considerable debate, the following decision was made:

That as a general principle it is desirable that the model in the Life School should be undraped, and that any partial concealment for considerations of decency would rather tend to attract attention to what might otherwise pass unnoticed. It appears to

the Council that the particular objection suggested by a needless fidelity sometimes observable in drawings, is a question of taste rather than morals, and they are therefore of the opinion that the objection should be met by recommending and requiring the Visitors to dissuade Students from bestowing unnecessary attention on unimportant parts, especially when decency suggests their being passed over.⁹²

It is, I think, worth noting that the debate on fidelity to life is considered one of taste rather than morality. This concern with propriety before realism is reflected in the debate that surrounds Rossetti and the Aesthetic school. The preoccupation that is shown by the school with women and refined taste is perceived as lacking in virility. While at the beginning of the 1870s Buchanan feels that Rossetti and Swinburne stress the sensual, the attitude to Aestheticism is increasingly one of distaste among the many who do not share the intense inclinations of the convert. Buchanan's description of the unhealthiness of the Fleshly School would appear to be most in tune with later popular judgements. Although in terms of serious criticism the style and tone of Buchanan's essay is obsolete, it conformed to many of the prejudices current in broad middle-class taste. With such taste came a growing belief in the unmanliness of the Aesthetic elite.

The model of manliness was one that developed and changed considerably throughout the nineteenth century. Ed Cohen outlines some of the complexity of this ideological transformation.⁹³ The ideal of 'manliness' moved from an essentially aristocratic model in the eighteenth century of 'hunting, riding, drinking and "wenching"' through an oppositional middle-class model in the early nineteenth century.⁹⁴ The initial middle-class paradigm might be characterised as

continent and strong in spirit. This first middle-class model, Claudia Nelson maintains, could represent the ideal of manliness as achieved by a bedridden invalid as it was essentially androgynous and spiritual in character.⁹⁵ As the nineteenth century progressed, however, the emphasis moved from simple Christianity to 'Muscular Christianity.' In literary terms this paradigmatic transformation might be characterised as one from Fielding's Tom Jones to Hughes's Tom Brown, via Austen's Edmund Bertram. Yet the ideological debate has its further contradictions and complexities. In some ways the mature Tom Jones, saved from a life of vice by his basic good heart and the love of a good woman, suggests an early model for the later vigorous Christian ideal. In effect, Tom Brown is Jones but saved from early viciousness by a 'proper' education. This later definition of the manly, far from being androgynous, depends for its masculine identity on its polarity from the feminine. The manly middle-class male experiences 'tender' feelings through the mediation of the 'good' woman—herself inhabiting a world as distant from the 'fallen' woman as the 'good' woman's is from that of the male. But the very contradiction that Rossetti was experiencing in the practice of his profession—that of being no better than a whore—was leading him to picture a different sort of femininity. The image of women that Rossetti represented differed greatly from the ideal of women that had been generated by the entrepreneurial ideal. Modest, with dark hair severely pinned back, this earlier ideal had been sweet and good, projecting a domesticated, if not fully denied, sexuality. Rossetti 'pictured' an alternative 'body' to that of the accepted middle-class 'norm'.⁹⁶

The function that the female body performed as a subject 'in Aestheticist cultural productions' has been perceptively discussed by Kathy Psomiades.⁹⁷ The

productiveness of femininity has its source, according to Psomiades, in the gender ideology of the Victorian middle class. In conjunction with the 'central binary opposition masculine/feminine', she argues, 'there runs another equally important opposition between "good" femininity and "bad" femininity'.⁹⁸ What is significant is that 'good' and 'bad' do not appear 'as a relation among women' but rather as a 'middle-class woman's relation to herself.' Behind the perceived duality of woman's nature lies her value as an icon for Aestheticism. Psomiades formulates the problem for the Aesthetic artist through an informed discussion of Peter Bürger's Theory of the Avant-Garde; she claims that 'simultaneously knowing and not knowing that art serves no function and yet is bought and sold, holds a place for privacy and yet is implicated in public activity'.⁹⁹ Thus the problem for the artist of despising the market place and yet being dependent on it for his living is symbolised by the prostitute or 'bad' woman. Rossetti's 'Jenny' is used as an example by Psomiades, who proposes that the figure of the prostitute—'as she herself represents both knowledge of commodification and the refusal of that knowledge'—provides a symbol with which the artist can resolve his own dilemma. By usurping the feminine the male artist can himself be at once pure and corrupt; like Jenny, 'the prostitute [is one] who sells her body, but . . . is also the mysterious soul that cannot be compromised'.¹⁰⁰ In this image, the artist finds a counterpart in his at once 'knowing' and 'not-knowing' that the art he produces is for sale. This paradox is best understood, says Psomiades, in terms of Pierre Bourdieu's 'description of the "art business".' The market in works of art 'can only work by pretending not to be doing what [it is] doing'. Psomiades's analysis provides a convincing and useful explanation for the mobilisation of feminine icons by Aestheticism.

It is the ability of the artist to transform his model (who is at once modelling for a representation of a prostitute but is also in fact a prostitute) into the symbol of the materialist/altruist paradox that constitutes the artist's value to professional society. While the duality of the feminine may be the symbol of the modern artist, sexuality provides the subject. The precarious ethical character of the sexual exchange that must always exist somewhere upon a scale of moral measurement between the sordidly mercantile and the unapproachably sublime becomes a key trope for the relationship between the professional and the entrepreneurial fractions of the middle class. The consumption of art and artist is achieved by commodification, by the objectification of both the producer and produced as a single commodity – so we talk of a 'Rossetti' or a 'Turner', each painting a token of the whole. The integrity of the artist is therefore kept 'inviolable' by the nature of the 'art business', at least notionally, through the services of art dealers and critics who place a value on the artist's reputation. Individual paintings are, then, symbols of that reputation 'rented' to a materialist society while the artist's genius, like the whore's soul, remains unsullied by the transaction. In other words, the paintings are the artist's 'body' of work. As long as a professional elite can believe in this fiction, it can also believe that the services provided by that elite to entrepreneurial society are uncompromised by the materialism of that society. This belief is essential to support the notion, shared by the professional class and those classes it at once serves and rules, of the superior virtue and integrity that allows the professional to police entrepreneurial society. As we can see, however, this relationship is based essentially upon what is perceived as a 'feminine' model. It is dependent on the symbol of the duality of woman who can mobilise her purity as an influence on a

masculine world only through the carnal, as either wife or whore. Each of these choices – that is, wife or whore – threatens the pure core of woman/artist/professional (but that of the wife suggests greater involvement, even unity). The nature of the contract that is formed with the consumer, then, is of fundamental importance. The way the body/services are presented and consumed must reinforce the desired relationship.

The activities of the creative intellectual become accessible to a wider society, albeit in a modified form, through the mediation of the wider professional class. It was in the spirit of giving the representatives of modern art a prestigious space to present their case that Sir Coutts Lindsay and his associates Comyns Carr and C. E. Halle opened the Grosvenor Gallery on the 1 May 1877. The gallery met the Medici-like aspirations of its founder, Sir Coutts Lindsay (1824-1913), who was a baronet, an ex-Captain of the Grenadier Guards, and latterly, an Academic painter. The Grosvenor was a renaissance palace in green marble and gold paint. A palace perhaps more suited as a setting for a favourite courtesan than as a fit home for a wife. The purpose built gallery was designed by William Thomas Sams and cost a princely £150,000 to complete. Once built and opened the Grosvenor Gallery became forever associated with the later manifestations of Pre-Raphaelitism and the Aesthetic movement. When, in 1880, Gilbert and Sullivan arranged for Reginald Bunthorne to proclaim himself a 'greenery-yallery Grosvenor Gallery/ Foot-in-the-grave young man', the audience of *Patience* were in no doubt that he represented one of the new and advanced 'Aesthetes'.¹⁰¹

It is perhaps no coincidence that Oscar Wilde first became visible to the larger London world at the opening of the Grosvenor Gallery. As the soon-to-be self-proclaimed 'Professor of Aesthetics' and, later, as the model for Bunthorne,

the Grosvenor was the ideal setting for Wilde's debut. To an extent, Wilde was also representative of the new audience for art. It was widely believed that the works on display at the Gallery would appeal only to a cultivated minority and would be beyond the taste and understanding of the ordinary viewer. While a central feature of the development of the professional ideal is the belief that the professional is a specialist ultimately only to be judged by his or her peers in skill and education, such ventures as the Grosvenor Gallery served to inform the middle class of modern artistic tendencies. Although the Grosvenor Gallery was reinforcing the importance of exclusivity, both in its specialism and its intentions, the gallery clearly allied the artist to emerging professional idealism. Wilde's presence at the opening was very much in keeping with his wish to be associated with the earlier generation of Pre-Raphaelites and proto-aesthetes. Wilde was of a generation (born in 1854) that had grown up with both Pre-Raphaelitism and its later developments. In the closing section of this chapter it is surely appropriate to examine Wilde briefly as a case study in the developing relationship between Pre-Raphaelitism, professionalism, and middle-class male sexuality. In many respects Wilde's career accentuates the main features of how aspects of the feminine are mobilised to produce an alternative, and professional, middle-class masculinity.

V

On graduating from Oxford in 1878 Wilde stated his profession as Professor of Aesthetics. The fellowship for which he had hoped had not materialised and the offer he had been made to follow the admired Matthew Arnold as an inspector of schools had been rejected. Wilde's claimed professorship, however ironic, is evidence of his acceptance of the changing nature of the intellectual's world. The

days of the brilliant polymaths and sages, like Carlyle, are by and large gone. Instead, it is specialisation and professionalism that delineate the realm of the possible for the intellectuals who supersede the 'great men of letters'. It was specialism and professionalism that determined the relationship of the artist and critic to the modern marketplace. The relationship of the artist to a new climate of competition has been explored in a recent essay by David Peters Corbett, on the professional relationship of Wilde and his illustrator, Charles Ricketts. Peters Corbett identifies the radical specialisation on the artist as one that must ultimately rest on the recognised difference of the work of one artist from another. In his essay, Peters Corbett proposes that the '1890s saw issues of formal autonomy and creative uniqueness assume a stark importance for artist and writers'.¹⁰² He goes on to say, that 'the commodification of the art-work' followed a 'model of exchange in a market '. In effect, Peters Corbett asserts, the 'art world came increasingly to resemble other areas of bourgeois culture'. This 'commodification' of art resulted in increased competition between artists to establish their own, unique, contribution. A characteristic we see emerging in Pre-Raphaelite production, this competition was clearly identifiable by Ricketts himself. So, by the time Wilde was embarking on his career the effects of earlier developments in the way art and literature were produced and consumed, were already producing their own self-conscious response from artists.

Regenia Gagnier has examined Wilde's place in the commercial world that he entered.¹⁰³ The work of the artist, and the market he could command, was polarising remorselessly into a modernist configuration of the commercial and the avant-garde. Gagnier believes Wilde recognised that '[g]iven the late-Victorian marketplace, even intellectuals, a sort of classless class above the concerns of the

marketplace (as one says), had to specialise.' The classless isolation that Gagnier attributes to Wilde is not as satisfactory for analytical purposes as is positioning him within the emerging professional class. The importance of having a paradigm that identifies the professional ideal as significantly different from that of the middle class as a whole emerges as Gagnier proceeds to elaborate her argument. She very perceptively recognises that the 'social conditions that prevent us from emphasising the institution of art over the institution of specialisation clarify the professionalization of the aesthete'.¹⁰⁴ What Wilde recognised was the importance of the critic as an interpreter of the avant-garde first as a fraction of the professional class and then as it relates to other class interests.

It needs to be borne in mind that Wilde was not just a practitioner but also a significant consumer of Aestheticism. This was not only evident in his purchase of blue china and the paintings of Simeon Solomon but also in the use Wilde made of Aestheticism in constructing his social and professional personality. Wilde more than any of his contemporaries seems to have recognised that the tendency of late capitalism to convert everything into a commodity made the choice of what one consumed of enormous importance. The intention of Wilde to try to 'live up' to his blue china is of considerable significance in this context. If the professional ideal was to position itself in a critical relationship to industrial and commercial society the critics had to have comparative material. Wilde's intention suggests a highly telling development in the morality of consumption. Could the feminized work of art be replacing the 'Angel in the House' as an ethical paradigm of consumption—at least for the professional elite? The virtuous housewife took the wealth produced in the morally dubious world of business and, in spending this 'filthy lucre' to produce a safe and sanctified home-life for

her husband and children, 'laundered' it. Entrepreneurial wealth was justified in its 'pure' consumption by the respectable middle-class woman. The compromises of the materialist world become beneficial because they provide comfort and safety for wives and daughters. By undermining the 'good/bad' woman binary opposition of middle-class society, Aestheticism had created a moral vacuum for the professional ideal to fill. The anti-industrial and anti-materialist critical stance of Aestheticism formed the pure base of the professional critical position, and, as Gagnier has pointed out, it already had a lengthy tradition:

From the Romantic period on, English literary figures had criticised industrial capitalist society, even as they developed increasingly aristocratic or individualistic poses for the artist. The Romantics and Aesthetes thus participated in a new tradition—the inevitable rupture between society and a specialised realm of art, and the felt duty on the part of some artists to assume antibourgeois attitudes.¹⁰⁵

While the professional ideal associates itself with that critical position, the function of the professional class is to modify industrial society to make it less harmful to the rest of society. To achieve a beneficial transformation of mammon, the professional must become involved in the commercial world—yet has to remain apart from it. Through consumption of 'high-brow' art the professional comes to signal his critical position in relationship to the bourgeois commercial world in which he makes his living. It is the avant-garde artist who becomes a symbol of that 'apartness'—and achieves it by utilising a feminine viewpoint.

Pursuing a similar line of inquiry to Gagnier, Rita Felski identifies consumption as a significant identifier of the cultural moment of Aestheticism.¹⁰⁶ Unlike Gagnier, however, Felski places her emphasis on sexuality—more

explicitly, on the colonisation of the feminine that is evident in certain late nineteenth-century texts, including Wilde's Dorian Gray. In Felski's interpretation Wilde's adoption of taste and interest in decorative detail become indicative of accepted feminine characteristics: 'vanity, hypersensitivity, a love of fashion and ornamentation'.¹⁰⁷ Such a gendered reading is helpful in clarifying the relationships of producer and consumer of the avant-garde. Felski identifies the 'bourgeois encoding of production as masculine and consumption as feminine'.¹⁰⁸ Further, femininity, in Felski's words, has been 'appropriated by the male artist as emblematic of the modern'. The three novelists, whose work Felski discusses — Wilde, Huysmans and Sacher-Masoch — identify the feminine with the modern and in doing so are 'rejecting middle-class ideals of reason, progress, and industrious masculinity and defiantly celebrating perversity'.¹⁰⁹ Yet, significantly, none of the heroes of the novels that Felski is considering (The Picture of Dorian Gray (1890), Against the Grain (*A rebours*) (1884), Venus in Furs (1870)) considers himself an artist: 'the Romantic myth of the creative genius has become exhausted, and aesthetic pleasure is now located in consumption'.¹¹⁰ What Felski has identified, however, is not the gendered identity of the artistic producer, but that of the critic/consumer. Like his hero, Wilde did not consider himself an artist of genius — rather a consumer of genius. This is a proposition that Wilde explores and refines in 'The Critic as Artist' (1890). The artist of genius is increasingly being seen as a form of natural resource (as it is by Perkin). This is far from the sophisticated artificiality that Wilde and the Aesthetes cultivate. Yet their 'hypersensitivity' enables them to appreciate the difficult and esoteric productions of the avant-garde and interpret it for bourgeois consumption.

The purpose of art according to the aristocratic tradition of the eighteenth century was to protect the citizen not so much from the effeminacy of 'female charms' but from the 'rage to acquire and spend'.¹¹¹ That said, money spent on art, because of its intrinsic moral value, could not be considered a mere material acquisition. By the 1870s, the true aristocrat was consigned to cultural 'barbarity' by Matthew Arnold—and thus taste was the preserve of the professional class. The acquired aristocratic airs of Wilde, with the annexation of the 'feminine', provided a further platform for his criticism of bourgeois society. The assumed superiority of the Aesthete is maintained, if only in the minds of converts, by the moral superiority of the art and the artist that the aesthete consumes or interprets for society. In fact, Aestheticism is a critical position that exists in an appreciative, if not symbiotic, relationship to the emergence of avant-garde art.

Gagnier identifies a further condition to the production of this critical stance, that was in some ways parallel to the literary protests, as the increasing isolation of the universities as places of research: '[i]n 1876 a group of Oxbridge scholars produced "Essays on the Elements of Research", expressing contempt for bourgeois utility and calling for "the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake".'¹¹² Although pure research is placed above mere utility, scholars, while they are represented as unworldly and apart by bourgeois society, still remain part of the professionalizing apparatus. The universities played an important part in establishing the ideology of professionalism and continued to have an educational role in relationship to it. This was, to the professional, the university, and the academics who inhabited it, a comprehensible and necessary world. The artist, by contrast, was increasingly perceived as apart and, importantly, 'above' the marketplace. Gagnier maintains that Wilde represents art as involved in a battle

against the bourgeois world – of which the professional class are significant and dangerous members: '[t]he public and journalists impede art and menace the imagination, first because they are entirely utilitarian; . . second because they have gone over to specialisation ('Each of the professions means a prejudice,'); . . and third because specialisation has forced them to value evidence and proof above all'.¹¹³ It is true that Wilde attacks the principal tenets of the professional ideal – altruism, service and duty. In 'The Soul of Man Under Socialism' (1890), he writes:

With admirable though misdirected intentions, [altruists] very seriously and very sentimentally set themselves the task of remedying the evils that they see. But their remedies do not cure the disease: they merely prolong it. Indeed their remedies are part of the disease.

They try to solve the problem of poverty, for instance, by keeping the poor alive or, in the case of a very advanced school, by amusing the poor.

But this is not a solution: it is an aggravation of the difficulty. The proper aim is to try and reconstruct society on such a basis that poverty will be impossible. . . Charity creates a multitude of sins. . . It is immoral to use private property in order to alleviate the horrible evils that result from the institution of private property.¹¹⁴

It is only art that remains totally apart from the world that industry and commerce has created. Although the professional ideal works to alleviate the worst excesses the more successfully it does this the longer the misery will last.

Thus art becomes the only morality – that is, provided that art is produced purely for its own sake.

The work of art, according to the ideology of Aestheticism, becomes the exclusive measure of what is important to the cultivated individual. Yet the significance of art is only maintained by the increasingly 'other-worldliness' of the artist: 'Art is the only serious thing in the World. And the artist is the only person who is never serious'.¹¹⁵ Increasingly, the role of the artist appears to be that of the Fool in King Lear, to expose meaning through madness. Like the Fool the artist may speak the unspeakable – indeed, it is the function of the artist to do this. And the great unspeakable was sexuality. Wilde himself, according to Cohen, became the embodiment of 'homosexuality' and thus a text in which the unspeakable (and unprintable) could be spoken and written. In what Sinfield calls the 'queer moment' of Wilde's embodiment of the 'homosexual', a further transformation is achieved. The 'effeminacy' of the work of the artist as identified by middle-class critics like Buchanan and Austin becomes, instead, a characteristic of the artist's sexuality. So completely does the 'homosexual' come to embody the 'effeminate' that it is no longer possible to conceive of an art that explores femininity as being effeminate. Instead, the gendered spheres of the middle class have been neutralised as both justification and expression of a critical position. And a space had been achieved for the artist who, while of suspect sexuality, produced, through natural genius, significant work that the bourgeoisie was incapable of criticising. Achieving this naturalisation had been an enterprise of high risk.

Richard Dellamora traces the development of this version of male genius in Masculine Desire (1990). It was Ruskin who around 1860, on discovering some

sensual and pornographic work by his idol Turner, began to see the genius as 'almost inevitably linked with sexual irregularity and mental aberration'.¹¹⁶ The torment that Ruskin undergoes is displayed in 'masculine gender anxieties' and symbolised by such powerful feminine figures as Medusa. Those anxieties are transformed by Pater in The Renaissance (1873), into a positive homosexual identity for the artist of genius as exemplified by Leonardo. Dellamora identifies Pater's project as one that draws on a 'shamanic tradition, of . . . men able to be the impossible—to be, so to speak, both male and female—[and] were credited with a knowledge of elective affinities that gave them unusual power for good or ill'.¹¹⁷ To produce his 'magic' the male artist must move outside the conventional gender boundaries of bourgeois society, even at the risk of that society's displeasure. How great those risks were became evident in 1885 with the passing of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and was confirmed in 1895 with the trials of Oscar Wilde. Dellamora asserts the political nature of the scandals following the 1885 Act and the importance of a ruling elite based on homosocial institutions distancing itself from accusations of 'same-sex' practices. In criminalizing homosexual acts, Dellamora convincingly argues, patriarchal society placed homosexual men into a similar relative position to it as feminist women.

The effect of this legislation was to confirm the distance between those professions that in their enclosed structures tolerated homosexuality and the 'respectable' middle class. The criminalization of homosexuality isolates the entrepreneurial middle class from the source of ideological virtue, the 'feminine' perspective of the natural genius. The domestic virtue of the middle-class home justified the production of wealth and produced the moral certainty that was the foundation of its political power. In casting doubt on the validity of a dyadic

femininity — pure or corrupt — for a femininity that was at once pure and corrupt, Aestheticism undermined the moral authority of the entrepreneurial middle class. The moral absolutes of the professional's relationship to society are symbolised by the supposed unworldliness of the serious artist. The artist achieves this notional separation by utilising the symbol of the feminine generated by such images as those of Rossetti that picture the feminine as at once pure and corrupt — worldly and unworldly. So the concept of femininity that supports the ideal of the artist — and so professional integrity — is the very one that serves to undermine the authority of the entrepreneurial class. We can assume that it was Rossetti's attempts to utilise this conflicting concept of femininity, one which appeared to attack established cultural constructions of sexuality, that mobilised the forces of reaction. In their accusations of effeminacy, however, Buchanan and Austin employ a futile weapon. As Buchanan deplored the very mechanics of Rossetti's professionalization — the self-supporting group — so were sexuality and the feminine the defining subjects of professionalization.

The transfer of effeminacy from the cultural product to the culturally structured individual, as personified by Wilde, indicates a major transformation that took place in the years between 1870 and 1895. At the time when Rossetti's work could be perceived as the effeminate production of an artist too preoccupied with the flesh, the trial of the transvestites Ernest Boulton and Frederick William Park confirms the confusion that surrounded the practices and preferences of same sex-attraction.¹¹⁸ By 1880, the accusation of 'corrupter of youth' was becoming largely associated with the adult male sodomite — who was beginning to be seen as a congenital 'invert'.¹¹⁹ Wilde's trials, of course, fleshed out the whole construction of the homosexual, linking Aestheticism to same-sex passion.

However, the feminine point of view had been established as an essential element in the production of the artist's critique of industrial society. In the process of making homosexuality illegal middle-class society irrevocably separated itself from the production of 'virtue'. Entrepreneurial society's own domestic model of virtue, the 'separate spheres', had been undermined as a political model, and the commercial middle class were now dependent on professional society to provide moral certainty. While Wilde's conviction and identification as 'the' homosexual may have ended the rise of an overtly effeminate intellectual elite, his prosecution also confirms that the entrepreneurial middle class no longer commanded a critical position in terms of the culture they nominally shared. The artist, in possession of a sexually indeterminate natural resource, was the professional outside society. This natural resource was mined on behalf of professional society, first by the critics on the margin and then by the — only slightly more worldly — dealer. Professional society legitimised this whole process in retrospect, by giving honours to the once avant-garde. Safely isolated from controversy by hindsight, professional society nevertheless reaped the harvest of the artist's 'natural' genius. The other-worldly/other-sexed aesthetic priesthood was effectively separated from the entrepreneurial middle class by force of law yet legitimised, in their isolation, the moral certainty of the professional class.

Notes to Chapter Five

¹ Walter Pater, Appreciations [1889] (London: Macmillan, 1924), 222.

² Walter Pater, 'Aesthetic Poetry' (1868), in Selected Works edited by Richard Aldington (London: William Heinemann, 1944), 77 — 83.

³ See, for example, Lynda Nead, Myths of Sexuality (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988); Lynne Pearce, Woman/Image/Text (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991); and Griselda Pollack, Vision and Difference (London: Routledge, 1988).

⁴ Lilith was in fact a succubus. A succubus (literally, one who lies under), according to legend, was a demon who appeared in the guise of a woman to rob the male victim of his seed and, presumably, his soul.

⁵ The sonnet that Rossetti published as 'Lady Lilith' in his Poems of 1870 and inscribed on the painting was later published in 1881 under the title 'Body's Beauty'.

⁶ Virginia M. Allen, "'One Strangling Golden Hair': Dante Gabriel Rossetti's Lady Lilith", Art Bulletin 66:2 (June 1884), 286.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 286.

⁸ Jeffrey Weeks, Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800 [1981] (London: Longman, 1989), 164–65.

⁹ William Butler Yeats, Autobiographies (London: Macmillan, 1955), 114.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 302.

¹¹ It was typical of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to take such a close interest in all the aspects of his sister's poetry. He made extensive efforts to assist her in publication, as well as giving her advice on the tone and content of her work. While Christina Rossetti welcomed her brother's involvement in her work, she seemed to have experienced little trouble in maintaining the involvement at a level with which she could cope and thought appropriate. For a full discussion of

the part that Dante Gabriel Rossetti played in his sister's career, see Lona Mosk Packer, Christina Rossetti (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963).

¹² Pearce, Woman/Image/Text, 3.

¹³ Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites, 1984, 200.

¹⁴ Kimberley Reynolds and Nicola Humble, Victorian Heroines: Representations of Femininity in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Art (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993), 64–5.

¹⁵ Tate Gallery, The Pre-Raphaelites (1984), 226.

¹⁶ Elizabeth K. Helsinger, Robin Lauterbach Sheets and William Veeder, The Woman Question, 3 vols. (New York: Garland, 1983), 3:147.

¹⁷ Griselda Pollock, 'Woman as Sign', in Pollock, Vision and Difference (London: Routledge, 1988), 124.

¹⁸ Ibid., 152.

¹⁹ Ibid., 153.

²⁰ 20. C. G. Jung, Aspects of the Feminine, translated from the German by R. F. C. Hull (London: Arc, 1986), 5.

²¹ Pollock, 'Woman as Sign', 154.

²² Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Ford Madox Brown, 28 May 1873 in Dante Gabriel Rossetti, The Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti 1871–1876 volume 3, edited by Oswald Doughty and John Robert Wahl (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 1175.

²³ Dante Gabriel Rossetti, cited in Allen, 'One Strangling Golden Hair', 286.

²⁴ Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Frederic George Stephens, 15 November 1871, F. G. Stephens Papers, Bodleian Library. The painting being discussed is not mentioned in the letter but from indications of size and complexity it could be the version in

oils of Dante's Dream at the Time of the Death of Beatrice (1871), now in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.

²⁵ David G. Riede, Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Limits of Victorian Vision (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983), 108.

²⁶ According to Alvin Sullivan, the Contemporary Review was originally published as an organ for the Metaphysical Society and, while generally priding itself on its liberal-mindedness, had a major interest in theology. It was certainly one of the best Victorian periodicals and numbered among its contributors Ruskin, Matthew Arnold and Walter Pater. Alvin Sullivan, ed. British Literary Magazines: The Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837–1913 (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983), 77–82.

²⁷ In 1872 Rossetti began to suffer from an hydrocele (an abnormal collection of fluid in any saclike space—especially around the testicles) that was operated on in the summer of 1877. His continual poor health was aggravated, if not caused, by his addiction to chloral (a drug to induce sleep) which he was inclined to take in excessive quantities when distressed. See also, Christopher D. Murray, 'D. G. Rossetti, A.C. Swinburne and R. W. Buchanan. The Fleshly School Revisited.' Bulletin of the John Ryland University Library 65: 1 (1982–83), 206–234.

²⁸ Murray, 'D. G. Rossetti, A. C. Swinburne and R. W. Buchanan. The Fleshly School Revisited', 206.

²⁹ Ibid., 208.

³⁰ [Robert Buchanan], 'The Fleshly School of Poetry', Contemporary Review (October 1871), 335.

³¹ Ibid., 335.

³² Podsnap appears in Our Mutual Friend (1864-5), in which Dickens attacks the purely material nature of the commercial middle classes, whose only morality seems to be to keep the young ignorant of sexual matters. This particular aspect is personified in Mr Podsnap, who was 'well to do, and stood very high in Mr Podsnap's opinion.' Mr Podsnap deals with the unpleasant by denying its existence, and hence his world is not 'very large . . . morally.' Charles Dickens, Our Mutual Friend [1864-5] (London: Penguin Classics, 1985), 174.

³³See Gary Schmidgall, The Stranger Wilde (London: Abacus, 1994), 215–229 and Weeks, Sex, Politics and Society, 87–106.

³⁴ Oswald Doughty, A Victorian Romantic--Dante Gabriel Rossetti [1949] (Oxford: OUP, 1960), 486.

³⁵ Michel Foucault, The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, translated from the French by Robert Hurley (London: Penguin, 1984), 125-6.

³⁶ Peter Gay, The Bourgeois Experience: Education of the Senses 3 vols (the first two volumes published in New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 1:7 and 81. While many of Gay's examples are American, the residents of New England in the second half of the nineteenth century were not noted for a more relaxed attitude to sexuality than their counterparts in old England.

³⁷ Dante Gabriel Rossetti, 'The Stealthy School of Criticism', Athenaeum (16 December 1871), 793.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 793.

³⁹ The sexuality of Dickens's characters is usually symbolised in a relationship to marriage or motherhood, for instance, in Great Expectations (1860–1), the jilted Miss Havisham whose disappointed sexuality leads her to corrupt the hopes of a

new generation, and the whore Nancy in Oliver Twist (1837–8) whose sexuality, in relation to Bill Sykes, is overtly maternalised.

⁴⁰ Weeks, Sex, Politics and Society, 20.

⁴¹ Linda Dowling, Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University, 1994), 13–20.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 13–20.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁴⁴ John Barrell, 'The Dangerous Goddess', in The Birth of Pandora (London: Macmillan; 1992), 63–65.

⁴⁵ Buchanan, 'The Fleshly School', 334.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 335. Spasmodic, in part, refers to the controversial Spasmodic poets of the 1850s—P. J. Bailey, J. W. Marston, S. Dobell and Alexander Smith—possibly Brigg as well. 'Spasmodic poems tended to describe intense interior psychological drama, were violent and verbose'. The Oxford Companion to English Literature, New Edition, edited by Margaret Drabble (London: Guild, by arrangement with OUP, 1985), 925. Their work was for a while highly thought of until W. E. Aytoun's parody of Firmilian, in 1854, destroyed their credibility.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 335.

⁴⁸ Alfred, Lord Tennyson, 'Merlin and Vivien' (originally published as 'Vivien' (1859)) in The Poems of Tennyson 3 volumes edited by Christopher Ricks (1969) (Harlow: Longman, 1987), 3: 412, lines 624–626.

⁴⁹ Walter E. Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1957), 368–9.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 335.

⁵¹ Linda Dowling, Hellenism and Homosexuality, 24.

⁵² F. G. Stephens Papers, MSS.DON.e.75:102–108. c.1875.

⁵³ Doughty, A Victorian Romantic, 488. Colvin later gained a reputation as a conservative critic as far as Aestheticism was concerned, and made some savage attacks on Walter Pater.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 488. Mademoiselle de Maupin was, of course, associated with lesbianism, see Théophile Gautier, Mademoiselle de Maupin (1835-6).

⁵⁵ Buchanan, The Fleshly School, 336.

⁵⁶ It is of interest to note that in his long and painful letter to Lord Alfred Douglas of January and March 1897, written while he was still in Reading Gaol, Oscar Wilde bemoans the loss of his Simeon Solomons which were sold in the bankruptcy resulting from his trials. In a letter that points to a significant change of heart, Buchanan wrote to the Star on 15 April 1895 protesting at the 'cowardice and cruelty' of Wilde's treatment. Cited in Rupert Hart-Davis edits the Letters of Oscar Wilde (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1962), 449. This was perhaps a further attempt on Buchanan's behalf to reclaim his credibility with contemporary writers.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 336-7.

⁵⁸ See Maura Bennett, 'Exhibition Reviews and Journalist Art Critics in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries', and Michaela Giebelhausen, 'Languages and the Construction of Value in the Reviews of Pre-Raphaelite Paintings, 1849-1854'. Both papers were delivered at the 1994 Association of Art Historians' Conference, held at the University of Central England, Birmingham.

⁵⁹ Buchanan, 'The Fleshly School', 336.

⁶⁰ Barrell, 'The Dangerous Goddess', 65.

⁶¹ Walter Hamilton, Aesthetic Movement in England [1882] (reprinted in London: Folcroft Library, 1973), 52.

⁶² William Michael Rossetti, The Diary of W. M. Rossetti 1870–1873, edited by Odette Bornard (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1977), 115, n. 1.

⁶³ Ibid., 117.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 127, n.1, from Algernon Charles Swinburne, The Swinburne Letters, 2 vols., ed. Cecil Y. Lang (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1959), 2: 169–170.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 132.

⁶⁶ Doughty, A Victorian Romantic, 487-8.

⁶⁷ Algernon Charles Swinburne, Poems and Ballads: First Series [1866] (London: William Heinemann, 1917), 110.

⁶⁸ John Ruskin in Doughty, A Victorian Romantic, 490.

⁶⁹ Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Jane Morris: Their Correspondence, Wednesday 10 March 1880, 148.

⁷⁰ Robert Buchanan, cited in W. M. Rossetti, Diary 1870-3, 55, n. 5.

⁷¹ Joseph Bristow, "'What if to her all this was said?'" Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Silencing of "Jenny", Essays and Studies 46 new series (1993), 96–117.

⁷² Line numbers refer to the poem as printed in Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Poems and Translations 1850-1870 (London: Oxford University Press, 1913).

⁷³ See, Robin Sheets, 'Pornography and Art: The Case of "Jenny",' Critical Inquiry 14 (Winter 1988), 315–334, and Hall's Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art (London: John Murray, 1984), 90.

⁷⁴ Sheets, 'Pornography and Art' (1988), 317.

⁷⁵ Daniel A. Harris, 'D. G. Rossetti's "Jenny": Sex, Money, and the Interior Monologue', Victorian Poetry 22 (1984), 210.

⁷⁶ Helsinger, The Woman Question (New York: Garland Publishing, 1983), 3:157.

⁷⁷ Christine Battersby, Gender and Genius: Towards a Feminist Aesthetics [1989] (London: The Women's Press, 1994).

⁷⁸ Heyck, The Transformation of Intellectual Life (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1982), 223.

⁷⁹ Algernon Swinburne, 'The Poems of Dante Gabriel Rossetti', Fortnightly Review 7 (May 1870), 570.

⁸⁰ Alan Sinfield, The Wilde Century: Effeminacy, Oscar Wilde and the Queer Moment (London: Cassell, 1994), 26.

⁸¹ Ibid., 31.

⁸² Carol Christ, 'The Feminine Subject in Victorian Poetry', ELH 54 (1987), 385—401.

⁸³ Ibid., 397.

⁸⁴ Dorothy Mermin, 'The Damsel, the Knight, and the Victorian Woman Poet', Critical Inquiry 13 (Autumn 1986), 64—80.

⁸⁵ Christ, 'The Feminine Subject in Victorian Poetry' (1987), 385.

⁸⁶ Mermin, 'The Damsel, the Knight, and the Victorian Woman Poet' (1986). 65.

⁸⁷ Michael Mason, The Making of Victorian Sexuality (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 280.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 282.

⁸⁹ Helsinger, The Woman Question 3 (1983), 158.

⁹⁰ Herbert Sussman, Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 137.

⁹¹ Ibid., 111.

⁹² Sidney C. Hutchison, The History of the Royal Academy 1768-1968, London: Chapman & Hall (1968), 119 (this is in the chapter on 1850-1868 – and the debate is probably happening around 1861).

⁹³ Ed Cohen, Talk on the Wilde Side: Toward a Genealogy of a Discourse on Male Sexualities (New York: Routledge, 1993).

⁹⁴ Ibid., 39.

⁹⁵ Claudia Nelson, 'Sex and the Single Boy: Ideals of Manliness and Sexuality in Victorian Literature for Boys', Victorian Studies 32:4 (Summer, 1989), 525-550.

⁹⁶ Cohen, Talk on the Wilde Side, 24.

⁹⁷ Kathy Alexis Psomiades, 'Beauty's Body: Gender Ideology and British Aestheticism', Victorian Studies 36:1 (1992), 31 – 52.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 36.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 33.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 47.

¹⁰¹ See Barrie Bullen, 'The Palace of Art: Sir Coutts Lindsay and the Grosvenor Gallery,' Apollo (November 1976), 352-357.

¹⁰² David Peters Corbett, "'Collaborative resistance': Charles Ricketts as Illustrator of Oscar Wilde', Word and Image 10:1 (January-March, 1994), 23.

¹⁰³ Reginia Gagnier, Idylls of the Marketplace: Oscar Wilde and the Victoria Public (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1987).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 11-12.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 12.

¹⁰⁶ Rita Felski, 'The Counterdiscourse of the Feminine in Three Texts by Wilde, Huysmans, and Sacher-Masoch', PMLA 106:5 (October 1991), 1094–1105.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 1095.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 1095.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 1098.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 1095.

¹¹¹ Barrell, 'The Dangerous Goddess', 65.

¹¹² Gagnier, Idylls of the Marketplace, 12.

¹¹³ Ibid., 20.

¹¹⁴ Oscar Wilde, 'The Soul of Man Under Socialism', in The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde, 1948, London: Collins (1991), 1079.

¹¹⁵ Wilde, 'A Few Maxims for the Instruction of the Over-Educated', *ibid.*, 1203.

¹¹⁶ Richard Dellamora, Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 118.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 133.

¹¹⁸ Weeks, Sex, Politics and Society, 101.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 107. The structure of the practice of same sex groups interestingly reflects the development of the 'small cultural formations' that are so characteristic of the emergent avant-garde. The 'coteries of sodomites' identified by Weeks, are structurally reminiscent of Rossetti's 'clique'. While I have no wish to draw conclusions from this similarity beyond the structural links it indicates between

an emergent avant-garde and professional masculine sexuality, I do think it worth noticing.

Conclusion

This dissertation has traced the changing conditions of artistic production experienced by a significant group of Victorian painters. Beginning with the formation of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood I have identified emerging interests and practices that had a powerful influence on the development of a different kind of professional art and art market. The desire in those artists to pursue an artistic career as a modern professional has proved to be the unifying imperative that has linked what might at first appear to be disparate activities and concepts. These would include art criticism, art exhibitions, and the association of artists, critics, and patrons in a series of informal and formal groupings – and, in the representation of women, a convergence towards a modern subject. In the period between the 1840s when Pre-Raphaelitism began, and the 1870s when Rossetti achieved his artistic maturity, the idea of what it meant to be a professional artist changed considerably. It was the recognition of an ideological structure that could provide an insight into how and why this change occurred that made possible the analysis undertaken in my dissertation. Moreover, I have argued that Pre-Raphaelite cultural practices had a significant bearing on the changes that were taking place in the way that art was produced, viewed, evaluated and consumed. Indeed, that the discourse on professionalism that is characteristic of the emergence of a self-conscious modernism in the 1890s is certainly partly a product of Pre-Raphaelite innovation.

Many of the practices identified in this dissertation have been the subject of earlier research. The professionalization of art criticism and the art market, of exhibiting strategies and of the artist's studio, have all been examined in recent years, as my dissertation shows. Feminist art historians have analysed the significance of Pre-Raphaelite images of women, and women's involvement as professional (or sub-professional) artists and models. In particular feminist analyses have identified the involvement of women in their ancillary professional roles as an indication of middle-class male concerns and class interests. There has, however, been little attempt to produce any unified explanation that links various professional developments with the successful strategies of individual artists or the interests of particular class fractions. It is the identification of fractional class concerns that has made it possible to reconsider feminist readings of Pre-Raphaelite production. Awareness of group interests within a class produces an approach that, while retaining a feminist perspective, explains an apparent contradiction. In reading Pre-Raphaelite representations of women as at once oppositional to the middle-class ideal of femininity and at the same time establishing the complementary opposite to that ideal, the patriarchal male identity, feminist art historians have identified a paradox that requires a much more detailed explanation. There exists a clear need to establish a greater refinement of class and gender analysis in the mid and late-Victorian period. By combining the approaches of the social historian with that of the cultural historian a greater awareness of inter-class sub-divisions can be achieved and a beginning can be made to supply that increased refinement.

Necessarily, my dissertation has produced lengthy analytical arguments on the nature of Pre-Raphaelite artistic and critical production. In doing so I believe

it has provided a framework for a more detailed re-reading of Pre-Raphaelite representations of women. Much of the space in this dissertation has been taken up with constructing that analytical framework leaving only a limited opportunity to exploit it in the examination of a series of works. I would envisage two strands of research developing from my thesis. One would extend the research done so far by exploring in more detail how the representation of femininity evolved within the Pre-Raphaelite project and determine the extent to which the professional function of such representations served to establish modern themes. The second is more conjectural and involves addressing the questions that this research has raised about the relationship between Pre-Raphaelite work and the professional debates and production of the 1880s and after. Clearly, the professional exploitation of femininity and the function of the female model as a paradigm of the male artist's inspiration and work – and the relationship of both to his market – necessarily changes once that goal is achieved. Having usurped the necessary feminine virtues and models of femininity to achieve the artistic viability that he desires, does the male artist then attempt to obliterate and hide this theft in the reassertion of a polarised gender difference? In a world where professionalism and masculinity are increasingly associated with the mastery of the machine the objectification of women in cultural production that is at least partially achieved by late Pre-Raphaelitism, would seem to be a likely and significant development.

APPENDIX A:

Contributions to the Pre-Raphaelite exhibition of 1857 as listed by William Michael Rossetti in Ruskin: Rossetti: PreRaphaelitism, Papers 1854 to 1862 [1899] (reprint New York: AMS Press, 1971), 71-2:

Ford Madox Brown: The Last of England, The English Autumn Afternoon, Windermere, The Brent, Carrying Corn, King Lear (the tent scene with Cordelia), Shorn Ridgway, Study of an Infant, Beauty before she became acquainted with the Beast, The Prisoners of Chillon, a Portrait of Myself [this painting must be William Michael Rossetti, Painted by Lamplight, which Tate Gallery, 1984 has as first exhibited at Russell Place, 1857] and The Parting of Cordelia and her Sisters.
Holman Hunt: The Haunted Manor, Sketch from a House in New Cairo, The Great Sphinx and the Tennyson Designs photographed.

Millais: The Wedding Cards, The Foxglove, Portraits of Wilkie Collins and Holman Hunt.

Miss Siddal: Clerk Saunders, Sketches from Browning and Tennyson, We are Seven, The Haunted Tree, and a Study of a Head.

Dante Gabriel Rossetti: Dante's Dream of the Death of Beatrice, The Anniversary of the Death of Beatrice (Dante drawing an angel), Mary Nazarene, Mary Magdalene, The Blue Closet, Hesterna Rosa, and the Tennyson Designs photographed.

Remaining exhibitors were Bond, Boyce, Brett, Campbell, Collins, Davis, Dickinson, Halliday, Hughes, Inchbold, Arthur Lewis, Martineau, Seddon, Scott, Windus, J. D. Watson, and Woolf.

APPENDIX B:

List of Members of the Hogarth Club on a card from 1859 in the possession of William Michael Rossetti:

G. F. Bodley, G.P. Boyce, John Brett, F. Madox Brown, W. S. Burton, James Campbell, J. M. Carrick, John R. Clayton, Eyre Crow, jun., William Davis, Alfred D. Fripp, Michael F. Halliday, Arthur Hughes, Alfred W. Hunt, W. Holman Hunt, J. W. Inchbold, Edward Burne-Jones, Edward Lear, F. Leighton, Robert B. Martineau, William Morris, T. Morten, J. W. Oakes, J. H. Pollen, Val. Prinsep, Dante G. Rossetti, John Ruskin, W. B. Scott, J. R. Spencer Stanhope, Frederic G. Stephens, George Edmund Street, John L. Tupper, Henry Wallis, G. F. Watts, Philip Webb, W. L. Windus, Benjamin Woodward, Thomas Woolner.

Honorary Members:

David Cox, F. Danby, ARA., Eug. Deacon, W. Dyce, RA, William Hunt, J. F. Lewis, W. Mulready, RA,

There were also a few non artistic members, William Rossetti among them, and of course Thomas Carlyle was the most distinguished honorary non artistic members. William Michael Rossetti, Ruskin: Rossetti: PreRaphaelitism, Papers 1854 to 1862 [1899] (reprint New York: AMS Press, 1971), 216-7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A.Y.- R. S. 'Pre-Raphaelitism from Different Points of View'. Fraser's Magazine 53 (June 1856), 686—93.
- Allen, Virginia M. "One Strangling Golden Hair": Dante Gabriel Rossetti's Lady Lilith. Art Bulletin vol. LXVI no. 2 (June 1984), 285—94.
- Altick, Richard D. The English Common Reader. A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800—1900. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Amor, Anne Clark. William Holman Hunt: the true Pre-Raphaelite. London: Constable, 1989.
- Arnold, Matthew. Culture and Anarchy with Friendship's Garland and Some Literary Essays. Edited by R. H. Super. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- 'Art I.' Eclectic Review (January, 1856), 2—20.
- Ballantyne, John. 'The Pre-Raffaellites'. Art-Journal (1 July 1851), 185-6.
- Barickman, Richard, Susan MacDonald, and Myra Stark. Corrupt Relations: Dickens, Thackeray, Trollope, Collins, and the Victorian Sexual System. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Barrell, John. The Birth of Pandora and the Division of Knowledge. London: Macmillan, 1992.
- Bate, Percy. The English Pre-Raphaelite Painters. London: George Bell, 1902.
- Battersby, Christine. Gender and Genius: Towards a Feminist Aesthetics. London: The Women's Press, 1989.
- Bell, Quentin. Victorian Artists. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.
- — —. 'The Pre-Raphaelites and their Critics'. In Pre-Raphaelite Papers. Edited by Leslie Parris. London: Tate Gallery, 1984.
- Benjamin, Walter. Charles Baudelaire: a lyric poet in the era of High Capitalism. Translated by Harry Zohn. London: Verso, 1983.
- Bennett, Mary. 'The Pre-Raphaelites and the Liverpool Prize'. Apollo 67 (December 1962), 748—53.
- — —. 'A Check List of Pre-Raphaelite Pictures exhibited at Liverpool 1846—67,

- and some of their Northern Collectors'. Burlington Magazine 105 (November 1963), 486–93.
- — —. 'The Price of 'Work': the background to its first exhibition, 1865'. In Pre-Raphaelite Papers. Edited by Leslie Parris. London: Tate Gallery, 1984.
- — —. Artists of the Pre-Raphaelite Circle: The First Generation. Catalogue of works in the Walker Art Gallery, Lady Lever Art Gallery and Sudley Art Gallery. London: Lund Humphries, 1988.
- Bentley, D. M. R. "Ah, Poor Jenny's Case": Rossetti and the Fallen Woman/Flower'. University of Toronto Quarterly 5 (1980–81), 177–98.
- Best, Geoffrey. Mid-Victorian Britain 1851–75. 1971. London: Fontana, 1979.
- Bristow, Joseph. Empire Boys: Adventures in a Man's World. London: Harper Collins Academic, 1991.
- — —. "'What if to her all this was said?" Dante Gabriel Rossetti and The Silencing of 'Jenny'.' Essays and Studies 46 (new series) (1993), 96–117.
- Brockenhurst, Judith. "An interesting series of adventures to look back upon": William Holman Hunt's Visit to the Dead Sea in November 1854'. In Pre-Raphaelite Papers. Edited by Leslie Parris. London: Tate Gallery, 1984.
- Brod, Harry ed. The Making of Masculinities. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987.
- Brown, Ford Madox. The Diary of Ford Madox Brown. Edited by Virginia Surtees. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- 'Brown's Pictures, Mr F. Madox'. Art Journal 27 (March-May 1865), 156.
- 'Brown's Pictures, Mr Madox'. Athenaeum. 1950 (11 March 1865), 353.
- [Buchanan, Robert]. 'The Fleshly School of Poetry'. Contemporary Review (October, 1871), 334–50.
- Buckley, Jerome Hamilton. The Victorian Temper. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Bullen, Barrie. 'The Palace of Art: Sir Coutts Lindsay and the Grosvenor Gallery'. Apollo (November 1976): 352–57.
- Burne-Jones, Edward, 'The Newcomes'. Oxford and Cambridge Magazine (January 1856), 50–61.

- Burne-Jones, Georgiana Macdonald. Memorials of Edward Burne-Jones. 1904. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.
- Burton, Anthony. 'Nineteenth Century Periodicals'. The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines. Edited by Trevor Fawcett and Clive Phillpot. London: The Art Book, 1976.
- Campbell, Colin. The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Carlyle, Thomas. Sartor Resartus, Heroes and Hero Worship and Past and Present. London: Ward, Lock, n. d.
- — —. Critical and Miscellaneous Essays 7 volumes. (1869) London: Chapman and Hall, n. d.
- Cassirer, Ernst. The Philosophy of the Enlightenment. 1955. Reprint, Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.
- Casteras, Susan P. English Pre-Raphaelitism and Its Reception in America in the Nineteenth Century. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press, 1990.
- Chandler, Alice. A Dream of Order. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.
- [Chapman, John?]. 'Pre-Raphaelitism'. Westminster Review 63. New series 7 (January-April, 1855), 293–94.
- Cherry, Deborah. Painting Women: Victorian Women Artists. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Cherry, Deborah and Griselda Pollock. 'Patriarchal Power and the Pre-Raphaelites'. Art History 7: 4 (1984), 480–95.
- Chesneau, Ernest. The English School of Painting. 3rd edition. London: Cassell, 1887.
- Christ, Carol. 'The Feminine Subject in Victorian Poetry.' ELH 54 (1987), 385–401.
- Christian, John. '"A Serious Talk": Ruskin's Place in Burne-Jones's Artistic Development'. Edited by Leslie Parris. Pre-Raphaelite Papers. London: Tate Gallery, 1984.
- Codell, Julie F. 'Marion Harry Spielmann and the Role of the Press in the Professionalization of Artists'. Victorian Periodical Review 22: 1 (spring,

- 1989), 7–15.
- — —. 'The Fine Arts Quarterly Review and Art politics in the 1860s'. Victorian Periodical Review 23: 3 (fall, 1990), 91–7.
- — —. 'The Dilemma of the Artist in Millais's Lorenzo and Isabella: Phrenology, the Gaze and the Social Discourse'. Art History 14: 1 (March 1991), 51–66.
- Cohen, Ed. Talk on the Wilde Side: Toward a Genealogy of a Discourse on Male Sexualities. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Collini, Stefan. Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850–1930. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Colvin, Sidney. 'English Painters and Painting in 1867'. Fortnightly Review 2 (new series) (1 July–1 December 1867), 464–76.
- 'Concerning Pre-Raphaelitism'. Every Saturday. Boston (4 April 1868), 442–46.
- Corbett, David Peters. "'Collaborative resistance": Charles Ricketts as illustrator of Oscar Wilde'. Word and Image 10: 1 (January–March 1994), 22–37.
- Corbett, David Peters and Andrew Thacker. 'Raymond Williams and Cultural Formations: Movements and Magazines'. Prose Studies 16: 2 (August 1993), 84–106.
- Coveney, Peter. Poor Monkey. London: Rockliff, 1957.
- Dallas, E. S. The Gay Science 2 volumes. London: Chapman Hall, 1866 (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1969).
- Daly, Gay. Pre-Raphaelites in Love. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1990.
- Davidoff, Leonore. 'Mastered for Life: Servant and Wife in Victorian and Edwardian England'. Journal of Social History (1974), 406–28.
- Davidoff, Leonore and Catherine Hall. Family Fortunes: Men and women of the English middle class, 1780–1850. London: Hutchinson, 1987.
- Dellamora, Richard. Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- Dickens, Charles. Oliver Twist (1837–8) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- — —. Great Expectations (1860–1) London: Penguin Books, 1965.
- — —. Our Mutual Friend (1864–5) London: Penguin Classics, 1985.

- Dobbs, Brian and Judy Dobbs. Dante Gabriel Rossetti: an alien Victorian. London: Macdonald and Jane's, 1977.
- Doughty, Oswald. A Victorian Romantic—Dante Gabriel Rossetti. 1949, reprint London: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Dowling, Linda. 'Esthetes and Effeminati'. Raritan 12: 3 (winter 1993), 52—68.
- — —. Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford. Ithaca N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Drabble, Margaret, ed. The Oxford Companion to English Literature. London: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Eagleton, Terry. Literary Theory. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.
- Eliot, Simon and Beverley Stern, eds. The Age of Enlightenment, an Anthology of Eighteen-Century Texts 2 vols. London: Ward Lock Educational, in association with the Open University, 1979.
- Ellman, Richard. Oscar Wilde. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1987.
- Ellman, Richard, Editor. Oscar Wilde: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Eisenman, F. Stephen. With contributions by Thomas Crow, Brian Lukacher, Linda Nochlin and Frances K. Pohl. Nineteenth Century Art: A Critical History. London: Thames and Hudson, 1994.
- 'Exhibition of the Society of Artists.' Birmingham Journal and Commercial Advertiser. Supplement (Saturday, 11 September 1852), 1.
- Faulkner, Peter, editor. Jane Morris and Wilfred Scawen Blunt. Exeter: Exeter University Publications, 1986.
- Faxon, Alicia Craig. Dante Gabriel Rossetti. London: Phaidon Press, 1989.
- Felski, Rita. 'The Counterdiscourse of the Feminine in Three Texts by Wilde, Huysmans, and Sacher-Masoch'. PMLA 106: 5 (October 1991), 1094—105.
- Fletcher, Ian. Union and Beauty: the examination of some 19th century minority periodicals. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Reading University, 1965.
- Flint, Kate. 'Reading The Awakening Conscience rightly'. In Pre-Raphaelites reviewed. Edited by Marcia Pointon. Manchester: Manchester University

Press, 1989.

'Fine Arts' Exhibitions of 1849, The'. Fraser's Magazine (July 1849), 73–81.

Ford, Ford Madox. Ford Madox Brown: a Record of his Life and Work. 1896. New York: AMS Press, 1972.

Foster, Hal ed. Postmodern Culture. Foster. London: Pluto Press, 1985.

Foucault, Michel. The History of Sexuality: An Introduction. Translated from the French by Robert Hurley. 1976. London: Peregrine Books, 1984.

Frascina, Francis and Jonathan Harris edit. Art in Modern Culture: an Anthology of Critical Texts. Published in association with the Open University. London: Phaidon Press: 1992.

Fredeman, William E. Pre-Raphaelitism: a bibliocritical study. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.

— — —. Editor of The P. R. B. Journal. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1975.

Frith, William Powell. 'Crazes in Art; Pre-Raphaelitism and Impressionism'. Magazine of Art 11 (1888), 190–91.

— — —. My Autobiography and Reminiscences. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1888.

Fry, Roger. Vision and Design. (1920) London: Pelican Books, 1961.

Gagnier, Reginia. Idylls of the Marketplace: Oscar Wilde and the Victorian Public. 1986. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1987.

Garrigan, Kristen. 'Bearding the Competition: John Ruskin's Academy Notes'. Victorian Periodical Review 23:4 (winter, 1987), 148–56.

Gaunt, William. The Pre-Raphaelite Dream. Originally published as 'The Pre-Raphaelite Tragedy' in 1942. London: The Reprint Society, 1943.

— — —. The Aesthetic Adventure. 1945. London: Sphere Books, 1975.

Gautier, Théophile. 'English Art from a French Point of View'. Temple Bar 5 (July 1862), 320–26.

Gay, Peter. The Enlightenment: An Interpretation. 2 The Science of Freedom. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970.

— — —. The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud. 1. Education of the Senses.

- New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- — —. The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud. 2. The Tender Passion. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Gilbert, K. E. and H. Kuhn. A History of Esthetics 1939. Reprinted New York: Dover Publications, 1972.
- Girouard, Mark. The Return to Camelot. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Gissing, A. C. William Holman Hunt: a biography. London: Duckworth, 1936.
- Golby, J. M., editor. Culture and Society in Britain 1850—1890. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Gray, Robert. 'Bourgeois Hegemony in Victorian Britain'. Sally Hibin edits The Communist University of London: Politics, Ideology and the State. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1978, 73—93.
- Grilli, Stephanie. 'Pre-Raphaelitism and Phrenology'. In Pre-Raphaelite Papers. Edited by Leslie Parris. London: Tate Gallery, 1984.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 'Modernity — An Incomplete Project'. in Postmodern Culture edited by Hal Foster. London: Pluto Press, 1985, 3—15.
- — —. The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity. Translated by Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987.
- Hall, James. Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art (revised edition). London: John Murray, 1984.
- Hamerton, Philip Gilbert. 'The Salon of 1863'. Fine Arts Quarterly Review (October 1863), 228—61.
- — —. 'Analysis and Synthesis in Painting'. Fine Arts Quarterly Review (May 1864): 247—54.
- — —. 'The Reaction from Pre-Raphaelitism'. Fine Arts Quarterly Review (May 1864), 253—62.
- — —. Thoughts About Art 1873. Reprinted London: Macmillan, 1889.
- — —. Human Intercourse. London: Macmillan, 1884.
- Hamilton, Walter. The Aesthetic Movement in England 1882. Reprinted London: Folcroft Library, 1973.

- Harris, Daniel A. 'D. G. Rossetti's "Jenny": Sex, Money, and the Interior Monologue'. Victorian Poetry 22 (1984), 197–215.
- Harrison, Martin and Bill Waters. Burne-Jones. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1973.
- Hart-Davis, Rupert. Editor of The Letters of Oscar Wilde. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1962.
- Hartnell, Roy. 'The Pre-Raphaelites and Birmingham: The Early Years', Pre-Raphaelite Society [Newsletter] 6 (Autumn, 1990), 2–3.
- Hauser, Arnold. The Social History of Art 4. 1951. Reprinted London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1989.
- Helsing, Elizabeth K., Robin Lauterbach Sheets and William Veeder. The Woman Question 3 vols. New York: Garland, 1983.
- — —. 'Passionate Heroines: Fallen, Sensation, and Fleshly'. Chapter 4 in The Woman Question 3. New York: Garland, 1983.
- Helsing, Elizabeth K. 'Consumer Power and the Utopia of Desire: Christina Rossetti's "Goblin Market".' ELH 58 (1991), 903–33.
- Heyck, T. W. The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England. London: Croom Helm, 1982.
- Hill, Christopher. The Collected Essays. Volume 3. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1986.
- Hilton, Timothy. The Pre-Raphaelites. London: Thames and Hudson, 1970.
- Hindus, Milton. Walt Whitman: The Critical Heritage. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. The Age of Capital 1848–1875. London: Sphere Books, 1977.
- Hogg's Instructor 7. New Series. Edinburgh: James Hogg (1851).
- Houghton, Walter E. The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830–1870. 1957. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Humphreys, Henry Noel. Ten Centuries of Art: Its Progress in Europe from the IXth to the XIXth Century. London: Grant and Griffith, 1852.
- Hunt, Diana Holman. My Grandfather, His Wives and Loves. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1969.

- Hunt, John Dixon. The Pre-Raphaelite Imagination 1848–1900. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.
- Hunt, William Holman. 'The Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood: a fight for Art'. Contemporary Review (June 1886), 820–33 and (July 1886), 475–88.
- — —. Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1905.
- Hutchison, Sidney C. The History of the Royal Academy 1768–1968. London: Chapman & Hall, 1968.
- James, Sir William. Editor. The Order of Release: The story of John Ruskin, Effie Gray and John Everett Millais. London: John Murray, 1947.
- Jenkyns, Richard. Dignity and Decadence: Victorian Art and the Classical Inheritance. London: Harper Collins, 1991.
- Jones, Gareth Stedman. Outcast London: a study in the relationship between classes in Victorian London. 1971. Reprinted with a new preface London: Penguin, 1984.
- Jullian, Phillipe. Dreamers of Decadence. Second edition. London: Phaidon Press, 1974.
- Jung, C. G. Aspects of the Feminine. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. London: Ark, 1986.
- Kappeler, Susanne. The Pornography of Representation. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1986.
- Keary, C. F. 'The Germ'. Macmillan's Magazine (September 1876), 439–47.
- Knight, Joseph. Life of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. London: Walter Scott, 1887.
- Knoepfmacher, U. C. and G. B. Tennyson, editors. Nature and the Victorian Imagination. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- Ladd, Henry. The Victorian Morality of Art: An Analysis of Ruskin's Esthetic. New York: Octagon Books, 1968.
- Laing Art Gallery, The. Pre-Raphaelites: Painters and Patrons in the North East. Newcastle upon Tyne: Tyne and Wear Museums Service, 1989.
- Landow, George P. "'Your good influence on me': The correspondence of John

- Ruskin and William Holman Hunt'. Bulletin of the John Ryland Library, Manchester 59: 1 and 2 (autumn 1976—spring 1977), 95—129, 367—96.
- Lang, Cecil Y. editor of The Swinburne Letters: 2 volumes. New Haven: Yale University Press: 1959.
- Larson, Magali Sarfatti. The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- La Sizeranne, Robert de. English Contemporary Art. Translated by H. M. Poynter. Westminster: Archibald Constable, 1898.
- Leslie, C. R. A Hand-Book for Young Painters. London: John Murray, 1855.
- Lodge, David. The Modes of Modern Writing. London: Arnold, 1977.
- — —, editor. Modern Criticism and Theory. New York: Longman, 1988.
- Longford, Elizabeth. A Pilgrimage of Passion: The Life of Wilfred Scawen Blunt. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979.
- Maas, Jeremy. Victorian Painters. New York: Putnam, 1969. Reprinted New York: Harrison House, 1988.
- — —. Gambart, Prince of the Victorian Art World. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1975.
- — —. The Victorian Art World in Photographs. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1984.
- Macleod, Dianne Sachko. 'F. G. Stephens, Pre-Raphaelite Critic and Art Historian'. Burlington Magazine 128 (June, 1986), 398—402.
- Madden, William A. Matthew Arnold: A Study of the Aesthetic Temperament in Victorian England. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967.
- Maitland, Thomas [Robert Williams Buchanan]. 'The Fleshly School of Poetry: Mr. D. G. Rossetti'. Contemporary Review (October 1871), 334—50.
- Mangan, J.A. and James Walvin. Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800—1940. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987.
- Marcus, Laura. 'Brothers in their anecdotage: Holman Hunt's Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood'. Pre-Raphaelites re-viewed. Edited by Marcia Pointon. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.

- Marcus, Steven. The Other Victorians. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.
- Marsh, Jan. Pre-Raphaelite Sisterhood. London: Quartet Books, 1985.
- — —. Jane and May Morris. London: Pandora Press, 1986.
- — —. Pre-Raphaelite Women. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987.
- — —. The Legend of Lizzie Siddal. London: Quartet Books, 1989.
- Mason, Michael. The Making of Victorian Sexuality. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Masson, David. 'Art VII. Pre-Raphaelitism'. British Quarterly Review 16 (August 1852), 197–220.
- Matthiessen, F. O. Editor. The Oxford Book of American Verse. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- McGann, Jerome. 'Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Betrayal of Truth'. Victorian Poetry 26 (1988), 339–61.
- Mermin, Dorothy. 'The Damsel, the Knight, and the Victorian Woman Poet.' Critical Inquiry 13 (autumn 1986), 65–80.
- Michie, Helena. The Flesh Made Word. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Mikhail, E. H. Editor. Oscar Wilde: Interviews and Recollections 1. London: Macmillan, 1979.
- Millais, John Guille. The Life and Letters of Sir John Everett Millais, PRA 2 vols. London: Methuen, 1899.
- Milner, Frank. Pre-Raphaelites on Merseyside. York: Village, 1985.
- 'Minor Topics of the Month'. Art Journal (June 1857), 294.
- 'Minor Topics of the Month'. Art Journal (July 1857), 326.
- Morris, May ed. William Morris: Artist Writer Socialist 2 vols. 1936. Reprinted New York: Russell & Russell, 1966.
- Mort, Frank. Dangerous Sexualities: medico-moral politics in England from 1830. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Mumford, Lewis. The Brown Decades: A Study of the Arts in America 1865–1895. [1931] New York: Dover Publications, 1955.
- Murray, Christopher D. 'D. G. Rossetti, A. C. Swinburne and R. W. Buchanan.

- The Fleshly School Revisited: 1'. Bulletin of the John Ryland University Library Manchester 65: 1 (1982-3), 206–34.
- — —. 'D. G. Rossetti, A. C. Swinburne and R. W. Buchanan. The Fleshly School Revisited: 2'. Bulletin of the John Ryland University Library Manchester 65: 2 (1982-3), 176–207.
- Nead, Lynda. Myths of Sexuality. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- — —. The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Neale, R. S. Class and Ideology in the Nineteenth Century. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Nelson, Claudia. 'Sex and the Single Boy: Ideals of Manliness and Sexuality in Victorian Literature for Boys'. Victorian Studies. 32:4 (Summer, 1989), 525–50.
- Open University, The. The Enlightenment: A204, William Hogarth unit 7. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press, 1979.
- — —. The Arts Foundation Course: A102, Culture: Production, Consumption and Status units 22-6. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press, 1986.
- Original, The. A Periodical Established By A Few Young Men as an Amusement For Their Leisure Hours. Liverpool: The Albion Office (1849).
- Oxford. Oxford English Dictionary. Second edition on compact disc for IBM PC. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Packer, Lona Mosk. Christina Rossetti. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.
- Palgrave, Francis Turner. 'English Pictures in 1865'. Fortnightly Review 1 (May–August 1865), 661–74.
- Parrinder, Patrick. Authors and Authority: English and American Criticism 1750–1990. London: Macmillan, 1991.
- Parris, Leslie ed. Pre-Raphaelite Papers. London: The Tate Gallery, 1984.
- Pater, Walter. The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry (1873). London: Macmillan, 1925.

- — —. Marius the Epicurean (1885). London: Macmillan, 1927.
- — —. Appreciations with an essay on style (1889). Reprinted London: Macmillan, 1924.
- — —. Walter Pater: Selected Works. Edited by Richard Aldington with an Introduction. London: William Heinemann, 1948.
- Pearce, Lynne. Woman/Image/Text: readings in Pre-Raphaelite art and literature. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
- Pearsall, Ronald. The Worm in the Bud: The World of Victorian Sexuality. 1969. London: Penguin, 1981.
- Peattie, Roger. 'William Michael Rossetti's Contributions to the Athenaeum'. Victorian Periodical Review 23:4 (winter 1991), 148–55.
- Perkin, Harold. Origins of Modern English Society. London: Routledge, 1969.
- — —. The Structured Crowd. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1981.
- — —. The Rise of Professional Society. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Pick, Daniel. Faces of Degeneration. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- 'Pictures of the Season, The'. Blackwood's Magazine 68 (July 1850), 77.
- Pilkington, Matthew. A General Dictionary of Painters. 1829. Revised by Allan Cunningham. London: Thomas Tegg, 1840.
- Pointon, Marcia. Mulready. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1986.
- — —. 'The Artist as Ethnographer: Holman Hunt and the Holy Land'. Pre-Raphaelites re-viewed. Edited by Marcia Pointon. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- — —. 'Histories of Matrimony: J. E. Millais'. Pre-Raphaelites re-viewed. Edited by Marcia Pointon. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- — —. ed. Pre-Raphaelites re-viewed. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- Pollock, Griselda. Vision and Difference. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Poole, William Frederick. Poole's Index to Periodical Literature. 1802—81. Revised and edited by Peter Smith. Gloucester, Mass.: 1958.

- Praz, Mario. The Hero in Eclipse in Victorian Fiction. 1956. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, The. The Germ. 1850. Reprint with an introduction by W. M. Rossetti. London: Eliot Stock, 1901.
- 'Pre-Raphaelite Exhibition, A'. Saturday Review 4: 88 (4 July 1857), 11–12.
- 'Pre-Raphaelite Magazine, A - 1. The Germ'. Every Saturday 5. Boston (16 May 1868), 618–22.
- 'Pre-Raphaelitism (a discussion on Dr. Waagan's letter to The Times)'. Art-Journal 6 (1854), 250–51.
- 'Pre-Raphaelitism. Millais's Picture of "Ophelia"'. Birmingham Journal and Commercial Advertiser. Supplement to Saturday (11 September 1852), 1.
- Psomiades, Kathy Alexis. 'Beauty's Body: Gender Ideology and British Aestheticism'. Victorian Studies 36. No. 1 (fall 1992), 31–51.
- Pye, John. Patronage of British Art. 1845. London: Cornmarket Press, 1970.
- Reach, Angus B. 'Town Talk and Table Talk'. Illustrated London News (4 May 1850), 306.
- Reade, Brian. Sexual Heretics: Male Homosexuality in English Literature from 1850 to 1900. An Anthology Selected with an Introduction. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Reader, W. J. Professional Men: The Rise of the Professional Classes in Nineteenth-Century England. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.
- 'Review of The Germ'. Art-Journal 12 (March 1850), 96.
- 'Review of Ruskin's "Pre-Raphaelitism"'. The Builder 9: 449 (Saturday, 13 September 1851), 571–72.
- 'Review of Ruskin's "Pre-Raphaelitism"'. Tait's Edinburgh Magazine 5. New series. 17–18 (1850–1), 626–29.
- 'Review of the Royal Academy Exhibition'. Art-Journal 11 (1849), 169–75.
- 'Review of The Royal Academy. 82nd Exhibition'. Art-Journal (1 June 1850), 165–77.
- 'Review of the Royal Academy Exhibition 1850'. The Builder (1 June, 1850), 255–

56.

Reynolds, Sir Joshua. Fifteen Discourses Delivered in the Royal Academy.

London: J. M. Dent, n. d.

Reynolds, Kimberley and Nicola Humble. Victorian Heroines: Representations of Femininity in Nineteenth-century Literature and Art. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993.

Riede, David G. Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Limits of Victorian Vision. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Rippingille, Edward Villiers. 'Pre-Raphaelitism; or Obseletism in Art'. Bentley's Miscellany 31 (June 1852), 598–609.

Roper, Michael and John Tosh. Manful Assertions. London: Routledge, 1991.

Ross, Robert. Aubrey Beardsley. London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1909.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. Poems and Translations 1850–1870: Together with the Prose Story 'Hand and Soul'. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.

— — —. 'The Stealthy School of Criticism'. Athenaeum. 2303 (16 December 1871), 792–94.

— — —. The Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti 1835–1860 vol. 1. Edited by Oswald Doughty and John Robert Wahl. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

— — —. The Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti 1861–1870 vol. 2. Edited by Oswald Doughty and John Robert Wahl. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

— — —. The Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti 1871–1876 vol. 3. Edited by Oswald Doughty and John Robert Wahl. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

— — —. The Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti 1877–1882 vol. 4. Edited by Oswald Doughty and John Robert Wahl. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

— — —. The Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti—Index vol. 5. Edited by Oswald Doughty and John Robert Wahl. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel and Jane Morris. Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Jane Morris: Their Correspondence. Edited with and introduction by John Bryson in association with Janet Camp Troxell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Rossetti, William Michael. 'Mr Madox Brown's Exhibition, and its Place in our

- School of Painting'. Fraser's Magazine 71 (May 1865), 598–607.
- — —. Fine Art, Chiefly Contemporary: Notices Reprinted, with Revisions. 1867. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- — —. Dante Gabriel Rossetti as Designer and Writer. London: Cassell, 1889.
- — —. Ruskin: Rossetti: PreRaphaelitism, Papers 1854 to 1862. 1899. New York: AMS Press, 1971.
- — —. PraeRaphaelite Diaries and Letters. 1900. Greg International, 1971.
- — —. Rossetti Papers, 1862 to 1870. 1903. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- — —. The PRB Journal: William Michael Rossetti's Diary of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood 1849–1853. Edited by William E. Fredeman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- — —. The Diary of W. M. Rossetti 1870–1873. Edited by Odette Bornand. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Rossetti, William Michael and Algernon C. Swinburne. Notes on the Royal Academy Exhibition 1868. [AMS Press facsimile reprint, 1976] London: John Camden Hotten, 1868.
- Ruskin, John. Pre-Raphaelitism, Lectures on Architecture & Painting: &c. 1851, 1855–9. London: J. M. Dent, Everyman's Edition, n. d.
- — —. 'The Three Colours of Pre-Raphaelitism'. Nineteenth Century 4 (July to December 1878).
- — —. The Crown of Wild Olives. Kent: George Allen, 1886.
- — —. Unto This Last & other essays on Art and Political Economy. London: J. M. Dent, n. d.
- Sambrook, James. ed. Pre-Raphaelitism. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974.
- Scharf, Aaron. Art and Photography. 1968. Reprinted with revisions London: Pelican Books, 1974.
- Schmidgall, Gary. The Stranger Wilde: Interpreting Oscar. London: Abacus, 1994.
- Scott, William Bell. Autobiographical Notes of the Life of William Bell Scott. 1892. New York: AMS Press, 1970.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial

- Desire. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Seligman, Edwin R. A. Editor. Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. Vol. 15. New York: Macmillan, 1962.
- Sennett, Richard. The Fall of Public Man. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Sheets, Robin. 'Pornography and Art: the Case of "Jenny"'. Critical Inquiry 14 (1987–88), 315–34.
- Sinfield, Alan. The Wilde Century: Effeminacy, Oscar Wilde and the Queer Moment. London: Cassell, 1994.
- 'Society of Artists' Exhibition: Preliminary Notice'. Birmingham Journal. Supplement (Saturday, 1 October, 1853), 1.
- 'Society of Artists' Exhibition: Third Notice'. Birmingham Journal. Supplement (Saturday, 15 October, 1853), 1.
- Spender, Stephen. 'The Pre-Raphaelite Literary Painters'. In, Pre-Raphaelitism. Edited by James Sambrook. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974.
- Staley, Allen. 'The Pre-Raphaelites at the Tate'. Burlington Magazine 126 (June 1984), 369–73.
- Stanford, Derek editor. Pre-Raphaelite Writing: an anthology. London: Dent, 1973.
- Stephens, F. G. Papers. Correspondence of F. G. Stephens, art critic (1828–1907). The Bodleian Library, Oxford.
- Sullivan, Alvin, editor. British Literary Magazines: the Romantic Age, 1789–1836. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983.
- — —. editor. British Literary Magazines: the Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837–1913. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1984.
- Sussman, Herbert. Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Sutton, Denys. James Mcneill Whistler: Paintings, Etchings, Pastels and Watercolours. London: Phaidon Press, 1966.
- Swinburne, Algernon Charles. Poems and Ballads: first series. (1866) London:

- William Heinemann, 1917.
- — —. 'The Poems of Dante Gabriel Rossetti'. Fortnightly Review 7 (May 1870). 551–79.
- — —. The Swinburne Letters 2 (1869-75). Edited by Cecil Y. Lang. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.
- Tate Gallery, The. The Pre-Raphaelites. London: Penguin, 1984.
- Tennyson, Alfred Lord. The Poems of Tennyson 3 volumes. Edited by Christopher Ricks (1969). Harlow: Longman, 1987.
- Thackeray, William Makepeace. Catherine: a story; Cox's Diary; The Paris Sketch Book. London: Caxton, n. d. [originally Catherine was published in Fraser's Magazine, 1839–40 and Cox's Diary in the Comic Almanac, 1840; Paris Sketchbook was published by Macrone in 1840].
- — —. The Newcomes 2 vols. 1855. London: Smith, Elder, 1886.
- — —. Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray, 4 vols. Edited by Gordon N. Ray. New York: Octagon Books, 1980.
- [Thornbury, Walter?] 'Fine-Art Gossip'. Athenaeum 1550 (11 July 1857), 886.
- Titmarsh, Michal Angelo [William Makepeace Thackeray]. 'A Pictorial Rhapsody'. Fraser's Magazine 21 (1840).
- — —. 'On Men and Pictures'. Fraser's Magazine 24 (1841).
- — —. 'May Gambols; or, Titmarsh in the Picture-Galleries'. Fraser's Magazine (June 1844).
- — —. 'Picture Gossip'. Fraser's Magazine (June 1845).
- Tosh, John. 'Domesticity and Manliness in the Victorian Middle Class'. Manful Assertions, Masculinities in Britain since 1800. Edited by Michael Roper and John Tosh. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Trevelyan, Raleigh. A Pre-Raphaelite Circle. London: Chatto and Windus, 1978.
- Treuhertz, Julian. Pre-Raphaelite Painting from the Manchester City Art Gallery. London: Lund Humphries, 1980.
- Tyrwhitt, The Reverend R. St John. 'Ancilla Domini: Thoughts on Christian Art'. Contemporary Review (September–December 1866), 182–97.

- — —. A Handbook of Pictorial Art. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875.
- Vaizey, Marina. The Artist as Photographer. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1982.
- Van, J. Don, and Rosemary T. van Arsdell, eds. Victorian Periodicals: A Guide to Research. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1978.
- Vance, Norman. The Sinews of the Spirit. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1885.
- Waagan, Dr. 'Artists and Works of Art in England'. Bentley's Miscellany 3 (1838), 173–81.
- Walker Art Gallery. William Holman Hunt: catalogue of exhibition at the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, March-April 1969. Edited by Mary Bennett. Liverpool: Walker Art Gallery, 1969.
- Walkley, Giles. Artists' Houses in London 1764–1914. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1994.
- Warner, Malcolm. 'John Everett Millais's "Autumn Leaves": "a picture full of beauty and without subject"'. In Pre-Raphaelite Papers. Edited by Leslie Parris. London: Tate Gallery, 1984.
- Weeks, Jeffrey. Sex, Politics and Society: the regulation of sexuality since 1800. Second edition. London: Longman, 1989.
- Weightman, John. The Concept of the Avant-Garde. London: Alcove Press, 1973.
- Whistler, James Abbott McNeill. The Gentle Art of Making Enemies. London: William Heinemann, 1890.
- — —. 'Ten 'o' Clock Lecture'. The Gentle Art of Making Enemies. London: William Heinemann, 1890.
- Whiteley, Jon. Oxford and the Pre-Raphaelites. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1989.
- Wiener, Martin J. English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850–1980. (1981) London: Penguin Books, 1992.
- Wilde, Oscar. The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde. 1948. London: Collins, 1991.
- — —. 'The Critic as Artist'. In The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde. 1948. London: Collins, 1991.

- — —. The Letters of Oscar Wilde. Edited by Rupert Hart-Davis. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1962.
- Wildman, Stephen. 'Opportunity and Philanthropy: the Pre-Raphaelites as seen and collected in Birmingham'. To be published in the forthcoming Vision of Love and Life: Pre-Raphaelite Art from the Birmingham Collection, England. Catalogue to Exhibition to be held in Seattle and tour (Art Services International), 1995-6.
- Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society 1780—1950. 1958. London: Penguin, 1963.
- — —. Keywords. 1976. London: Fontana Flamingo, 1983.
- — —. Marxism and Literature. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- — —. Problems in Materialism and Culture. London: NLB, 1980.
- — —. Culture. London: Fontana, 1981.
- — —. The Politics of Modernism. Edited by Tony Pinkney. London: Verso, 1989.
- 'Work of Young Men in the Present Age'. Oxford and Cambridge Magazine (September 1856), 558—64.
- 'Woman, Her Duties, Education, and Position'. Oxford and Cambridge Magazine (August 1856), 462—77.
- Wood, Christopher. The Pre-Raphaelites. London: Book Club Associates by arrangement with Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981.
- — —. Olympian Dreamers: Victorian Classical Painters 1860—1914. London: Constable, 1983.
- Yeats, William Butler. Autobiographies. London: Macmillan, 1955.
- — —. Memoirs. Edited by Denis Donoghue. London: Macmillan, 1972.
- — —. The Collected Letters of W. B. Yeats Volume 1 1865—1895. Edited by John Kelly, associate editor Eric Domville. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Young, Rev. Edward. Pre-Raffaellitism: or, A Popular Enquiry into some Newly-Asserted Principles connected with the Philosophy, Poetry, Religion, and Revolution of Art. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1857.

PAGE/PAGES
EXCLUDED
UNDER
INSTRUCTION
FROM
UNIVERSITY